

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o CXXIV. JULY 1906.

ART. I.—BACK TO THE LAND.

1. *Garden Cities in Theory and Practice.* Being an Amplification of a Paper on the Potentialities of Applied Science in a Garden City, read before Section F of the British Association. By A. R. SENNETT, M.I.C.E. &c. Two vols. (London: Bemrose and Sons, Limited, 1905.)
2. *The Poor and the Land.* Being a Report on the Salvation Army Colonies in the United States and at Hadleigh, England, with a Scheme of National Land Settlement. By H. RIDER HAGGARD. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1905.)

THE cry of 'Back to the Land,' it may be said, has never been more insistent and alluring than at the present moment, for the obvious reason that it has assumed a new civic and industrial aspect in addition to its more simple and primary agricultural character. The prospect which it conjures up for our appreciation is not merely the revival of agriculture by setting more men to work at tilling the soil—and thereby incidentally helping to solve the problem of unemployment, which has become increasingly urgent for serious attention during the last few years—though that purpose has by no means been forgotten. It also claims our consideration for much larger and more far-reaching promises. These include the decentralization of industrial trades, the

VOL. LXII.—NO. CXXIV.

S

sifting out of the dense masses of population congested in our great cities, and the multiplication, according to a well-ordered and systematic plan, of a new type of civilized community life, combining the advantages of town and country, and displaying the varied and complementary activities of industry and agriculture side by side. It is an attractive ideal, and we should all be on the alert to encourage its realization to the fullest possible extent. Anything that can be done on the one hand to make farming more satisfactory as a means of livelihood, and to open up neglected spheres of work on the land for the surplus stock of labour which the present competitive system of industry tends to produce, or, on the other hand, to check physical deterioration by planting out factories under healthier conditions, and to give industrial towns some of the grace and charm of village life, should be thoroughly assured of receiving an enthusiastic welcome.

In approaching this subject, however, it is important to bear in mind two obvious facts. First, the deplorable evils with which we have to deal in England are by no means peculiar to this country; and, secondly, in no respect can the remedies suggested for our acceptance lay claim to be regarded as entirely novel experiments.

The influx to the towns from the rural districts is a more or less common occurrence all over the world. It is taking place in a new country like Canada, as well as in an old country like England. The city of Toronto, for example, the capital of the province of Ontario, has grown at the expense of all the smaller towns and villages throughout the province. The learned professions there as well as the ranks of industry and commerce are continually being invaded by farmers' sons, who are no longer content to pursue the vocation of husbandry in their fathers' footsteps, and can take advantage of the admirable facilities for higher education which are placed within the easy reach of all aspirants. Some idea of the extent to which the population, even in what is still a predominantly agricultural country, is for ever shifting, may be derived from the fact that (as Earl Grey, the Governor-General of Canada,

told his audience at the banquet given in his honour by the Pilgrims' Club in New York at the end of last March) no fewer than 2,800,000 people of Canadian birth or descent have found homes in the great Republic of the United States. Again, we are beginning to realize that the agricultural problem in Russia has reached a most acute and menacing phase. And it would be just as correct to speak of the decay of agriculture in some of the Eastern States of America as with regard to some of our own English counties.

For instance, according to a recent statement :

' There are no fewer than 20,000 farms in New York State for sale. Most of them are unoccupied, and the prices asked are said to be sometimes much less than the worth of the buildings on them. So serious does the State consider this question of abandoned farms, with its economic and political ramifications, that the Department of Agriculture is maintaining as a side-issue a department of information regarding these farms, in connection with which is a sort of self-help bureau. The department prints bulletins giving all details in regard to the farms and agricultural conditions in the different parts of the State.'

' There is no mystery about the desertion of the farms. According to the State Commissioner of Agriculture, the expansion of business in the last ten years has drawn the young men and women alike from the farms and semi-rural districts. Many have deserted New York State and other States in the East, attracted by the advertisements of the railroad companies telling of the beauties and advantages of the Western States and Canada. Now New York is trying a little publicity on its own account. Probably fifty thousand farm workers can find immediate employment on the farms in that State, either as labourers or to work on shares. Anybody who wants to buy a farm, no matter what size or price, can be suited.'¹

There is, moreover, a continuous movement of farmers from the older and more settled parts of Canada to the newer provinces of the West, while their places are being taken by fresh immigrants from the United Kingdom or other foreign countries; and during recent years there has been a remarkable and increasing migration of the

¹ *Westminster Gazette*, March 14, 1906.

agricultural population of the United States over the border into Canada. During the nine months, July 1905 to March 1906, Canada received 85,749 immigrants; of these, while 54,778 entered through ocean ports, 30,971 came from the United States. The most recent returns published by the Labour Department of the Dominion of Canada shew that a large number of the new arrivals take the places of Canadians who have gone westward in search of independent farms of their own, and are at once assured of a much higher remuneration than an agricultural labourer could obtain in England.

'Immigrant arrivals during April were very heavy, and although official statistics were not available at the close of the month, the total was estimated to be in excess of any previous year. At Montreal, Que., during the opening week of the month, 8,630 immigrants arrived, compared with 2,910 in the same week last year. It was stated that 90 per cent. of the arrivals were from the British Isles, and were exceptionally prosperous, as evidenced by the amount of baggage which they brought with them. In Ontario large numbers of immigrants were distributed in the agricultural districts during April, taking the place of agriculturists who have moved into Western Canada. From \$28 to \$30 per month with board and washing was paid.'¹

In the next place, it is encouraging to observe that we are only asked to adopt or extend practicable schemes, which in this or that country are already in successful operation. Taking a comprehensive view, it may be said with reason that agriculture is now organized more economically and more efficiently than ever before; and even in England, as Mr. Pratt has recently shewn,² our farmers are beginning to apply some of the lessons to be learned from the scientific enterprise, the co-operative methods, and the commercial success of their foreign competitors. In fact, there has been no lack; and, indeed, apart from chronic and inevitable variations in the annual crops, there should

¹ The Dominion of Canada *Labour Gazette*, May 1906, p. 1248.

² Cf. E. A. Pratt, *The Transition in Agriculture* (John Murray, 1906).

be no serious fear of any future deficiency in the regular supply of wheat required for the world's needs.

No doubt this is poor consolation for the undeniable fact that there has been a most unfortunate and really dangerous decline of agriculture in Great Britain during the last thirty years. Rents have been reduced, on the average, 28·5 per cent., while the estimated amount of the farmers' profits fell by about one-half. The agricultural labourer, it is true, has improved his financial position; but his average earnings in England only amount to 18s. 3d. per week (it is as low as 14s. 6d. per week in Oxfordshire, inclusive of all allowances), and the total number of adult males employed in agriculture has fallen to less than a million. Nevertheless, agriculture can still be made to pay even in England by competent men, whether as large farmers or as small holders. The trouble is that—apart from any question about the amount of rent exacted by the landlords—English farmers are, as a class, slow to adopt scientific and business-like methods, and are extremely reluctant to co-operate together for their common interests. It is above all by co-operative methods of organization—*e.g.* associations for the purpose of buying and selling; butter factories and egg depots; village banks to provide cheap credit; experimental farms and scientific instruction—that the peasantry in foreign countries have been enabled to improve their economic position, and to make a profit on the vast quantities of agricultural and dairy produce exported to England.

Similarly, with regard to the unemployed question. The extent of unemployment has no doubt been greatly exaggerated in the public mind, as distinct from the far more dangerous results of the so-called 'sweating system,' under which workpeople are either grossly underpaid, or are employed during excessively long hours in badly ventilated and insanitary workshops. If we take the official returns published by the Board of Trade, we find that the amount of unemployment registered by the Trade Unions has never been excessively large. During the ten years, 1896-1905, the mean average rate of unemployment has ranged between

3½ and 4½ per cent. ; the actual percentage of unemployed members at any period has never fallen below 2 per cent., nor risen above 8 per cent.

It is greatly to the credit of the Trade Unions that more than 60 per cent. of their annual expenditure has been devoted to unemployed and other benefits. In 1904 the 100 Principal Unions paid no less than 647,722*l.* to their unemployed members, besides 850,793*l.* for other benefits. And in view of the common, but quite erroneous, idea that Trade Unions exist primarily to foment industrial strife, it may be well to quote the statistics provided by the Board of Trade.

‘ During the ten years under review, 16,060,000*l.* has been spent by the 100 Principal Unions. Of this amount about 2,343,000*l.*, or 14·6 per cent. of the total, has been spent on dispute pay, 3,608,000*l.*, or 22·5 per cent., on unemployed benefits, and 6,658,000*l.*, or 41·4 per cent., on other benefits (principally sick, accident, superannuation, and funeral benefits), the remaining 3,451,000*l.*, or 21·5 per cent., having been used in the payment of working and miscellaneous expenses.’¹

Of course, the amount of unemployment among unskilled and casual labourers in the unorganized trades has been much greater, but the statistics at our disposal do not shew anything like a desperate or appalling state of affairs. According to the returns supplied to the Labour Department of the Board of Trade by the Distress Committees under the Unemployed Workmen Act :

‘ From the date of the opening of the registers to the end of April, the total number of persons who had made application to thirty-seven distress committees in London and neighbourhood, and to eighty-seven committees in the rest of the United Kingdom, was 120,251, of whom 52,550 were in London and neighbourhood, 58,234 in the rest of England and Wales, 8,440 in Scotland, and 1,027 in Ireland. The number of cases that had been investigated was 102,716, and the results are known in the case of 94,826 persons, of whom 16,646 were found to be ineligible or not suitable for assistance under the Act.’²

¹ The Board of Trade *Labour Gazette*, March 1906, p. 69.

² *Ibid.* May 1906, p. 134.

At any rate, almost every conceivable method and agency for dealing with this problem has been actually put to the test of experience in one country or another, whether by the voluntary efforts of philanthropic bodies or by the legal and compulsory powers of the State. Even in England we seem at last to have grasped the necessity for classification: we have begun to distinguish between casual labourers, on the one hand, who are periodically thrown out of work owing to the fluctuations of trade; and, on the other, the incapable or inefficient residuum who are permanently unemployable, besides the peculiar class who deliberately prefer the profitable profession of vagrancy. And, however unsatisfactory and inadequate as a final solution, the Unemployed Workmen Act of last year was at least significant of two results of our haphazard and ineffectual attempts to grapple with this problem since the ill-omened Mansion House Fund in 1860. It is evident, firstly, that the public conscience will no longer tolerate an amount of distress and suffering arising from any involuntary lack of employment which a few years ago would have been generally regarded as an inevitable matter of course; and, secondly, that Parliament has arrived at the obvious conclusion that we should deal with this national problem, as with every other, on some definite and systematic plan.

Again, the growth of industrial villages by the establishment of a colliery, or the erection of a factory, or the introduction of petty trades suitable for domestic workshops in some small agricultural community is a familiar phenomenon in every progressive country. Not only are there many hundreds of such places in England to-day, but our great commercial and industrial centres have swallowed up miles of country for their own purposes, and the process is still going on under our eyes. In short, the only new feature of the 'Garden City' proposal is that this natural process should be consciously and deliberately directed and controlled according to some preconceived and well-thought-out plan. In a few particular instances, as we shall observe later on, industrial towns have been built to order,

with an eye to sanitary and æsthetic demands in addition to the minimum requirements of economical organization and convenience. We are now asked to apply this method in every direction, and to bring the movements of population, the growth of towns, and the organization of agriculture under some general and effective control. All this is entirely reasonable, and no one would seriously question the advisability of substituting to the utmost possible extent scientific management for casual and irregular developments.

One other general remark should be made. It is well to recognize quite frankly that what ultimately causes people to move from one place to another is for the most part a plain and simple economic motive. They shift in order to better themselves, as they hope, by finding elsewhere some more remunerative employment, and do not stop to weigh and balance the relative advantages of town and country life. For example we may refer to the conclusion of a series of interesting articles in the *Times* newspaper, dealing with the operation of the Aliens Act.¹ There has been for some years a constant stream of many thousands of Polish peasants passing through Grimsby on their way to Scotland. They are not Jews, nor 'undesirables,' we are told, but 'genuine country folk, apparently the superfluous sons and daughters of small farmers.' They are not running away to escape from Russian persecution, but simply come 'to make more money' in the mines and mills of Glasgow. And who would wish to blame them for that? We are not unaware, of course, that the fallacy known by the name of the 'Lump of Labour' theory is still entertained in some quarters. According to this theory, it is assumed that there is a fixed amount of work to be done at any particular moment, which must be done irrespective of the economic conditions. If, therefore, the supply of available labour is increased by an influx from abroad, while the demand remains stationary, it might be supposed that one or other of two possible results would follow. Either wages would be reduced, or, some men would be thrown out of employment. This same theory may also

¹ *The Times*, June 5, 1906.

be applied by the workman to check his efficiency and restrict the output, under the mistaken idea that he is thereby 'making work' for others to do. The truth is that the 'Lump of Labour' theory is utterly untenable. Otherwise, if it were true, we should have to set ourselves not only to restrict the use of machinery and all kinds of 'labour-saving' appliances but also to check the natural growth of the population. In this connection we may cite some remarks by Mr. H. Llewellyn Smith, now Controller-General of the Labour and Statistical Departments of the Board of Trade. In their original form they referred to the influx of population into London, but they also have a wider bearing.

'Free circulation of labour is the very life-blood of a modern industrial community. Wherever it stops, there is industrial disease. There is, indeed, movement which is healthy and movement which is unwholesome. The floating to and fro of the army of tramps and homeless wanderers is neither a cause nor a symptom of a sound state of the labour market. But the movement that represents real economic mobility, the power of ready transference of labour to new fields where it is in demand, is often the only safeguard a labourer possesses amid the many and complex dislocations of modern industry.'

'In every district there are round men confined in square holes. Often their only chance of finding the hole into which they can fit is to move elsewhere, and every time a man is fitted into the right hole a benefit is conferred on the community. In the language of political economists, the process of equalizing the advantages of various districts always increases the total sum of utility.'¹

We should, then, be ready and eager to encourage any ambitious country lad in England who aspires to something better than the average lot of an ordinary agricultural labourer—underfed, underpaid, and badly housed. If he goes to the town, he does as a rule get on, and improves his position by displacing the more effete and inefficient townsman; if we wish to retain him on the land, we shall have

¹ Booth, *Life and Labour of the People in London*, vol. iii., pp. 145, 146. (Macmillan, 1892.)

to supply him with a better prospect of securing for himself a decent standard of living in the country. On the other hand, there is no inducement for the vigorous and capable artisan to give up his well-paid trade for farming, though he may be willing enough to follow his factory, if it be transplanted into the country; while those who are on the down grade of physical deterioration have neither the will-power nor the practical energy required for the plodding and monotonous life of an agricultural labourer.

What we most of all need, then, is a comprehensive and constructive policy. It might be supposed that, by this time, the old policy of *Laisser-faire* had been thoroughly discredited in every direction; but, in fact, the generality of Englishmen are still more or less bound and trammelled by their individualistic traditions, and nearly always find it rather difficult to become more scientific and methodical.

To begin with, we should at once assume a larger and more effective control over the present and continuous growth of our towns. In this respect we may look to Germany for the most conspicuous and successful example of what ought to be done, and how it can be done. And those who would wish to learn how scientific methods may be applied to civic problems cannot do better than consult the admirable reports published two years ago by the Manchester 'Citizens' Association for the Improvement of the Unwholesome Dwellings and Surroundings of the People,' and compiled respectively by the energetic president and secretary of the association, Mr. T. C. Horsfall and Mr. T. R. Marr.¹

We have only space to quote two of the recommendations put forward by the Manchester Association. They urge, first:

'That a comprehensive housing policy be formed for the whole Manchester-Salford area, including the suburban and intermediate districts as well as those in the centre. Until such a

¹ *The Improvement of the Dwellings and Surroundings of the People; The Example of Germany.* By T. C. Horsfall. (University Press, Manchester, 1904.) *Housing Conditions in Manchester and Salford.* By T. R. Marr. (University Press, Manchester, 1904.)

policy is adopted we cannot hope for a solution of our difficulties. At present, while houses in the poorer districts are being closed, new residential districts are arising which, for lack of a real policy, will before many years be little better than slums. A comprehensive policy, as we understand it, would provide not only for the demolition of unwholesome dwellings and the statutory obligation to rehouse the occupants, but would also definitely provide for the growth of the towns, planning roads, streets and open spaces for the new districts long before they are actually required for building.'

And, secondly :

'That the growing complexity of modern municipal work makes it essential to have on the local administrative bodies a larger proportion of experts in the various departments, some of whom should be elected for periods of many years, should give their whole time to the work of the municipality and be adequately paid to do so.'

In this connection one other scheme deserves special mention. Owing to the energy and enthusiasm of Mrs. Barnett, it is now proposed to acquire an estate of 240 acres adjoining Hampstead Heath from the Eton College trustees, for the purpose of forming a 'Garden Suburb' on ideal lines. Certain parts of the estate will be leased to well-to-do people for large houses, while other parts will be reserved for small cottages and let to poorer tenants at low ground rents. Each house is to have its own garden, and every arrangement will be made to secure the general amenity and health of the community. If anyone be inclined to wonder whether the richer and poorer classes can be induced to live side by side, a glance at Sir Charles Booth's coloured maps of London should serve to explain that this already happens. No doubt particular districts, like Belgravia or Poplar, have a predominant character of their own; but it is remarkable how often the 'black' or lowest class are housed hard by the 'yellow' or wealthy classes. And, in any case, it is the speculative builder who is mostly to blame for the rows of small houses and miles of mean streets to be found in London; these are built simply because they pay best. There is good reason to hope that the capital required for

this enterprise will all be forthcoming; about 100,000*l.* has already been subscribed. And, when successful, it will be a most valuable object lesson for municipalities throughout the country, as shewing what can be done, even on the outskirts of the Metropolis, to house some thousands of people under wholly admirable and satisfactory conditions.

As regards the creation of industrial communities in the country, according to some definite plan, it is no longer necessary to argue at any length to prove its practicability. The thing has been done more than once, as Mr. Sennett's pages abundantly shew, and may, therefore, be done again. Everybody has heard of the model villages at Bournville and Port Sunlight, founded by Mr. George Cadbury and Mr. W. H. Lever; and similar institutions are to be found in other parts of the world, as, for instance, Herr Krupp's industrial village at Essen, Pullman City in America, Herr Van Marken's garden village at Delft, and Messrs. Suchard's settlement at Serrières. In each and every case, however, the success of the undertaking has been solely due to the powerful initiative of some great captain of industry or of some particular firm with an assured trade at its command and, no doubt, the special character of the business and the commercial convenience of the new arrangement were thoroughly taken into consideration. In other words, the economic conditions in general being altogether favourable, complete success was placed beyond any ordinary risk. And wherever similar circumstances prevail, large business concerns may safely be advised to found a new industrial centre for their own purposes in some rural district.

To some extent also, in spite of the cost involved, old-established factories are being removed from the great cities to the environs of smaller towns. Among the firms mentioned by Mr. Sennett as having removed from London are Messrs. W. H. Allen and Co. to Bedford, Messrs. Siemens Brothers to Stafford, and Messrs. A. Ransome and Co. to Newark-on-Trent. Messrs. Allen's engineering works were removed to Bedford in 1894. A convenient plot of thirteen acres was acquired, 400 houses were built for the accommo-

dation of their workmen, and by now a new district has sprung up with a population of about 5,000.

When we come to consider the attempt now being made at Letchworth to found what is called the 'First Garden City' in England, we are confronted by a much more speculative, and therefore more difficult plan. In this case the necessary capital to promote the venture has been subscribed, the land has been purchased, a considerable number of houses have been built, and the main lines of the estate have already been laid down. It is all perfectly admirable and correct so far as it has gone. But, it may reasonably be asked, where are the trades and industries which will be required to provide employment for the 35,000 people who are to constitute the ultimate limit of the population? A few small firms have already established themselves at Letchworth; but what is apparently the largest of these, the Heatly-Gresham Engineering Company, only promises to employ 150 men when its workshops are fully completed. In February last it was estimated that 1,500 persons were resident on the estate, of whom about 1,100 were new arrivals. Some 200 new houses have been built, and perhaps as many more are in process of construction. From a census of 134 new houses occupied by new residents, the following results were obtained.¹ (It would also be interesting to know how many of the residents go to London for their daily work by the new train leaving Letchworth at 7.55 A.M., and arriving at King's Cross at 8.55 A.M.)

Professional men	19
Managers, clerks, &c.	24
Contractors and master builders	14
Farmers and small holders	8
Tradespeople	4
Hotel and lodging-house keepers	8
Artisans	59
Labourers	27

¹ *The Garden City*, February 1906 (326A Birkbeck Bank Chambers, Holborn, W.C.: published monthly).

Domestic helps	25
Dressmakers, &c.	2
Other occupations and not known	26
Wives, grown daughters, and widows	120
Retired men and ladies of no occupation	19
Children of school age and under	184

It is needless, we hope, to add that we are in entire sympathy with the aims of the promoters of the 'First Garden City,' and we shall be among the first to congratulate them upon the final triumph of their benevolent enterprise. But for the present we are compelled to recognize that the complete success of the scheme depends mainly on its power to attract a much larger number of factories, in which considerable bodies of men can find regular employment. At any rate, we are grateful for the fact that Mr. Ebenezer Howard's original suggestion has been put to the test of practical experience; and it is encouraging to learn that it is also bearing fruit in other directions, as, for instance, in the development of a model village on Garden City lines on Mr. N. P. Miles' estate at King's Weston, near Bristol.

It is impossible, of course, in this article to discuss with any fullness the reorganization of agriculture; but a few general remarks may not be out of place. Much may be done, as already suggested, to improve the existing state of affairs by the wider introduction of scientific and co-operative methods. Sir Horace Plunkett has shewn what central creameries, farmers' associations, and agricultural banks can do for the Irish peasant, and the same kind of instruction and guidance is being given to English farmers by the Agricultural Organization Society. Moreover, this principle of co-operation has direct bearings upon the vexed question of railway rates. The British railway companies, apparently, are willing enough to meet the farmers halfway; but the latter should not expect to have their individualistic proclivities humoured by getting small retail lots of goods transported at wholesale prices.¹ A great

¹ For a fuller discussion of this whole subject, see E. A. Pratt, *The Organization of Agriculture* (Murray, 1904).

deal might also be done to prevent the present population from leaving the land by the provision of more and better cottages, as proposed by the 'Bill to amend the Housing of the Working Classes Act,' recently introduced by Mr. Mackarness. As the President of the Local Government Board remarked, during the discussion of this Bill, 'If Parliament, either by private enterprise, or municipal activity, or Imperial aid, could secure the building of 100,000 cottages in rural or semi-rural districts, from whatever source the money was provided, a great step forward would have been made.' We cannot forget, however, that for fifteen years prior to March 1905, Rural District Councils had power to buy land and build cottages under the Housing of the Working Classes Act of 1890; but, in fact, only four councils have carried out building operations, and only thirty-two houses in all have been erected. The fact is that cottages in the country are few and bad, chiefly because the occupants cannot afford to pay an adequate economic rent. In other words, the crucial difficulty of the present situation is the necessary outcome of the low and uneconomic rates of wages which are offered to the agricultural labourer; but, of course, any attempt to adjust these arbitrarily would inevitably raise the further question of fixing the farmers' rents. In this connection we may be permitted to commend a tract lately issued by the Fabian Society, entitled *The Revival of Agriculture*. Some of its suggestions, no doubt, will seem somewhat drastic, if not revolutionary, but at all events it represents a coherent and reasonable national policy, which may fairly claim to receive public attention. In any case, we venture to quote the final summary of the Fabian Society's plan:—

'To sum up: the breakdown of private enterprise in agriculture has left us with landlords and farmers impoverished, with agricultural labourers earning less than, or just over, subsistence wages. Much capital has been lost, the agricultural population has declined to a dangerous degree. There is no organization for the supply of our growing town markets, everywhere is chaos, while the foreign producer every day gains ground by superior organization. It is necessary for the State to

interfere, partly to secure the better utilization of our national resources, partly to increase our agricultural population. We must look forward to five and twenty years of resolute effort; prosperity cannot be restored in a day. The class most needing protection, the labourers, must be dealt with first in order to raise them to a decent level of comfort. A living wage must be secured to them, and, as a consequence, the farmers' rents must be fixed at a fair level. An Agricultural Court must be set up in each county to regulate wages and fix rents. Continental success in agriculture depends on co-operation, and that in turn is associated with the peasant proprietor system. That system for sundry reasons cannot be adopted here, but its advantages can be obtained through security of tenure. The small farm system should, therefore, form the basis of our reconstruction, free play being left for a graded system of farms where possible. In each county an Agricultural Committee should have compulsory power to acquire land and let it out to tenants, chiefly small holders. It should have power to advance capital to individuals on the collective guarantee of its tenants, and it should be its duty to organize the collection of farm produce and its disposal in the market.'

On all these and on innumerable other miscellaneous points, Mr. Sennett's two stout volumes may be used as a quarry for information, and nothing could exceed the zeal and perseverance with which he has studied his subject. Everything is included which can possibly be brought into any sort of relation with city life. Not only are such practical topics as road-making and house-building, or the various means of locomotion and lighting, discussed at great length; but also, to mention only a few samples, municipal *crèches* for babies, education, temperance, the administration of charity, apiculture, and the disposal of the dead. It must be confessed, however, that the mass of materials which he has laboriously collected has not been carefully sifted nor clearly arranged; he is often so discursive as to become rather tiresome, and is excessively fond of airing his own pet notions, though, no doubt, many of them are both sound and feasible. At any rate, we cannot but welcome him as an enthusiastic ally in a good cause.

Of Mr. Rider Haggard's scheme for a 'National Land Settlement,' not much need be said. The Church Army and the Salvation Army have proved beyond a doubt that the stream of emigration which is setting strongly towards Canada can be indefinitely stimulated at the rate of 10*l.* per head. The emigrants who have already gone this year have to that extent relieved the congestion at home, and will for the most part turn out excellent settlers. They will gain an immediate prospect of establishing independent homes for their families, and are by no means lost to the Empire. If we are prepared to adopt Mr. Rider Haggard's larger scheme—to send out 50,000 selected families, to provide them with land and capital on easy terms of repayment, and to arrange for some central control and direction—it should be easy enough to make farming pay, particularly in a new and open country like Canada. But whether the funds for such purposes should be left to be subscribed by voluntary agencies, or whether it would be worth while for the Government to undertake the settlement of 360 square miles of territory in Canada, remain questions about which authorities may be allowed to differ.

On the other hand, the evidence adduced by Mr. Rider Haggard in favour of the Salvation Army Colonies in England and America—we speak regretfully—has very little value from the economic point of view. Not one of these experiments has fully paid its way, nor, so far as we can see, is any ever likely to become a complete financial success. It may be well to state that the present writer has visited several of the farm colonies in England, including Hadleigh, and that the account given by the President of the Local Government Board in Parliament of his visit to the Salvation Army Settlements at Fort Romie and Fort Amity in California and Colorado entirely bears out the opinion here expressed.

Let us consider briefly the position at Hadleigh. The total amount of capital invested in the colony is said to be about 140,000*l.*, and in 1892 the annual deficit was between 4,000*l.* and 5,000*l.* Writing in February 1905, Mr. Rider Haggard tells us, indeed, that the annual deficit 'is now very

small, and when the brickworks, &c., are fully developed, there seems to be a probability that it will be wiped out altogether.' We should like to think so, but it puts a severe strain on our credulity. Why should we assume that 'the brickworks, &c.,' will ever become remunerative? And why did not the Salvation Army supply some more definite figures as to the actual losses incurred since 1892? The truth is that the Hadleigh colony should not be treated as an ordinary commercial enterprise at all. If it were simply a question of getting the most out of this Essex farm, the work could be done cheaper and better by a competent manager, who would be free to employ trained men at the regular rates of wages. As it is, the work at Hadleigh requires the paid assistance of some fifty or sixty labourers and skilled foremen, in addition to the zealous services of the Salvation Army officials. Hadleigh, in fact, is really devoted to the moral restoration of men who have gone wrong, for the most part owing to the temptations of strong drink. This kind of undertaking must always be expensive, but it is thoroughly justifiable when regarded in its true and proper light. Hadleigh does have a bracing effect on the selected men who are sent there, both morally and physically, and has given a fresh start in life to many who have undergone its discipline and training. We must acknowledge, however, that it appears to be impossible to get any accurate information as to what finally becomes of the men after they leave the colony. There are, it is true, letters to be seen from recent emigrants; but we have not yet been able to obtain trustworthy evidence to shew that any large proportion of the colonists have been permanently reformed.

It is much the same sort of story with regard to the colonies in America. The first attempt at Fort Romie, in 1898, was 'an utter failure'; the experiment cost about 5,400*l.*, and only one of the original eighteen families remains there to-day. (The head of this family, Mr. Burns told the House of Commons, was once a policeman in Battersea, and is now a sheriff.) At the second attempt in 1901, men were selected 'because they were farmers by

profession,' some of whom owned a little capital or stock, and there are now twenty families settled on twenty-acre lots. If all goes well, the colonists will ultimately possess their own farms, and the Salvation Army will recover the whole of their capital outlay. But, in fact, the final stage has not yet been reached.

The land at Fort Amity was bought in 1898 for 9,500*l.*, but the net financial result is that the colony has made an irrecoverable loss of about 4,600*l.* However, a number of colonists still remain, and may ultimately succeed in establishing themselves; but it is evident that they are subject to the same vicissitudes as other farmers.

'At the present moment there are upon the colony thirty-eight settlers, of whom six are "renters" or tenants. Since the inauguration of the venture, sixteen or eighteen families have left; some because they were not satisfied with the results; some because they found a rural life distasteful; some because of ill-health, and some because they thought they could do better elsewhere.'¹

A third colony at Fort Herrick, in Ohio, was started in 1899, when 'eight or nine families' were placed upon the land; but it was shortly afterwards abandoned as a complete failure. It is now used for a small inebriates' home, and for the purpose of making 'certain agricultural experiments.'

It must be admitted, then, that none of these experiments are distinctly encouraging. But let us remember that all the time a constant stream of emigration is going on, partly composed of those who rely upon their own resources, partly of those who receive a certain amount of help from philanthropic agencies. It seems advisable, therefore, to leave the management of emigration to private enterprise, without making any demand for subventions by the State.²

¹ *The Poor and the Land*, p. 68.

² The discussion in the House of Commons, on June 8, of the proposal to adopt 'a vigorous scheme of land settlement in South Africa,' elicited from Mr. Winston Churchill the information that, since the war, 'we have succeeded in settling 1,300 settlers in the

But there still remains an obvious and pressing duty for the State to perform, which falls more directly within its proper province, in the sense that the work could not possibly be done by voluntary agencies. We refer to the main recommendations of the Departmental Committee on Vagrancy, whose admirable report was published a few months ago. The magnitude of this special problem with which we have to deal is stated in the following terms :

‘ The only conclusion from the figures at which we arrive is that the number of persons with no settled home and no visible means of subsistence probably reaches, at times of trade depression, as high a total as 70,000 or 80,000, while in times of industrial activity (as in 1900) it might not exceed 30,000 or 40,000. Between these limits the number varies, affected by the conditions of trade, weather, and economic causes. In our inquiry we are more concerned with the habitual vagrant, that is, the class whom trade conditions do not affect. Of this class there is always an irreducible minimum, though successive depressions of trade may increasingly swell the numbers. No definite figures as to this permanent class can be obtained, but we are inclined to think that the total number would not exceed 20,000 to 30,000 ’ (p. 22).

Now, our present system of casual wards is generally acknowledged to be of no value whatever in reforming the vagrant, and the Committee therefore arrive at the following conclusions :

‘ The whole history of vagrancy in this and every other country indicates that the vagrant cannot be suppressed, but must be specially treated for his mode of life and his disinclination to do honest work. To apply this treatment it is essential that the habitual vagrant should be detained under reformatory influences for long periods. Under such influences it may be possible to instil into him habits of work ; but even if this should not be achieved by prolonged detention such as we recommend,

two colonies, and that has cost 2,400,000*l.*, or something like 1,800*l.* per settler.’ Each settler is, of course, the head of a family ; and, as Sir J. Dickson-Poynder remarked, about 2,200,000*l.* of the capital advanced by the State should ultimately be returned. There are also political reasons why British settlers should be encouraged in the Transvaal, even at some considerable cost to the State.

there are other reasons which render his segregation necessary. To protect the public from the trouble and the nuisance which he causes, to prevent children being trained in his habits, and to deter others from adopting this life seem to us objects which amply justify the course proposed.'

'Our recommendations constitute a complete scheme of which the main feature is the establishment of labour colonies. We have considered that the casual wards cannot be dispensed with at present, but we suggest that the Poor Law authorities should be relieved of the care of the vagrant—a matter indeed which is outside, and interferes with, their proper functions. The natural authority for controlling the vagrant is the police, and under them we hope that a uniform system will be established throughout the country. For the *bona-fide* work-seeker we have suggested means which should enable him to receive preferential treatment and real assistance when he takes to the road.'

'Lastly we would again draw attention to what, in our opinion, is the real cause of vagrancy, but which, unfortunately, is beyond the power of legislative or administrative action. Were it not for the indiscriminate dole-giving which prevails there would be little necessity for casual wards or labour colonies for the vagrant, and idle vagrancy, ceasing to be a profitable profession, would come to an end' (pp. 120, 121).

It should be noticed that, drastic as these proposals are, they are endorsed by most of the philanthropists and religious bodies which have had any practical experience of the almost insuperable difficulties in the way of reclaiming the wretched class of beings who exist at the lowest level of our social system. 'General' Booth is no less emphatic on this point than Mr. Rider Haggard. The former believes that 'most of the efforts to check the growth of the evil are rendered abortive chiefly by the fact that there is *no method of keeping the tramp in one place, and compelling him to work* until he acquires the habit of industry and prefers it to idleness'¹; while Mr. Rider Haggard roundly asserts that

'The adult "dead-beats," "born-tireds," "breakages," "alcoholics," tramps, "hoboes," criminals, "sneaks," "half-wits," dissolute women and the like are for the most part

The Vagrant and the Unemployable, p. 6.

beyond redemption, that is in the sense of turning them into useful and hard-working citizens. With their children something can be done—perhaps ; with themselves little or nothing. The generation which has suffered them to arise and haunt the courts and alleys of great towns, must bear the burden of their maintenance. No colony would receive them, nor can it be expected to do so. To employ them at the public expense means scamped work, executed at great cost and trouble ; to advance them money to enable them to help themselves means money lost.’¹

In conclusion we may briefly summarize the chief recommendations contained in this article.

(1) We should urge every municipality to exercise a stringent control over any further extension of its borders.

(2) We should encourage in every possible way the establishment of industries in rural or semi-rural districts.

(3) We should advocate the application of co-operative methods to agriculture, and endeavour to improve the condition of the agricultural labourer by providing him with a better cottage, and, above all, with better wages.

(4) While supporting the free labour colonies already engaged in efforts to promote moral reform or to train townsmen for agricultural pursuits, we should be even more insistent for the formation of compulsory labour colonies, under Government supervision and authority, for the detention of habitual vagrants.

ART. II.—ARCHBISHOP TEMPLE.

Memoirs of Archbishop Temple. By SEVEN FRIENDS. Edited by E. G. SANDFORD, Archdeacon of Exeter. With photogravure and other illustrations. In two volumes. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1906.)

ANY one who knows in its bare outline the career of Archbishop Temple may imagine what a wealth of material it would furnish for a most fascinating biography. The

¹ *The Poor and the Land*, p. xxv.

stern struggles of his childhood; the picturesque home where, under the training of a severe and intensely loving mother, the art of simple living and high thinking was practised to perfection; the undergraduate life in which the poor student toils unremittingly without fire, and by the light of the lamp on the staircase; the 'double first' won under such hard conditions, and with it the deep regard of the best men in Balliol, then at the zenith of its glory, including Ward, Shairp, Tait, Scott, Jowett; the gradual development and discipline of mind under circumstances calculated to bring out all its powers in the Education Office, then in its infancy, and at Rugby, then needing revival to the somewhat faded prestige of the days of Arnold; and, lastly, the unique arena for the exercise of every intellectual and spiritual faculty in successive calls to Exeter, London, and Lambeth—where on the pages of Church history, sparkling as they do with romance, will you find a story more romantic than this which adorns our own so-called prosaic epoch? And the man's own grand personality stands out so strong and rugged without, so tender and true within—heart of gold and will of iron. What a wealth of material, we repeat, for a most fascinating biography!

With high expectations, therefore, we turned to the *Memoirs*, compiled on the most elaborate scale of co-operative biography by seven friends, one of whom acts as contributory editor, and protracted over thirteen hundred crowded octavo pages. With every allowance for the mass of matter to be compressed, and for the richness of a life so varied, we cannot regard the outcome of the writers' labours as a complete success. The plan adopted does not allow the main interests to which Temple was devoted to be so treated as to present a well compacted whole, and the Editor's supplement, while skilfully drawn and displaying much subtle and acute insight, is too often a repetition in other words of what the earlier contributors have already told us. We wonder sometimes whether biographers, before putting pen to paper, clearly think out for what class of readers they design to write. To serve the purpose of

all save the specialist, and to satisfy the most ecclesiastically minded inquirer, lay or clerical, whole contributory sections of the work before us might have been materially condensed or omitted altogether. To what purpose is the reader wearied with so many details of educational problems now antiquated, of the abortive scheme of Kneller Hall, and of many visits and addresses of which only the barest skeleton can be reproduced? In our hurried and crowded days only those books will survive which preserve a due sense of proportion, and we cannot withhold our protest against the prevailing fashion largely followed in these volumes of so overloading a biography with 'appreciations' as to forestall the reader's independent judgement.

A modern writer insists that the secret of success amongst nations depends on the necessity imposed on them of surmounting great natural difficulties; and the like conditions largely prevail in the lives of individuals. Take some foremost names in the English episcopate: Stubbs, Benson, Temple—under what serious early disadvantages these men laboured. As with many other great men, Temple owed a vast debt to his mother's training. She was the only teacher he had until at twelve years of age he went to school. She taught him arithmetic and Latin with very little knowledge of either. If a sum was wrong she drew her pencil through it without remark, and it was done again until it was done right. Of Latin a few lines were learnt by heart daily, always repeating the old until several pages had been learned. In like fashion Euclid was committed to memory. Before he went to school he knew Euclid and the Latin grammar thoroughly, and could speak Italian and modern Greek. Blundell's at Tiverton did not, we gather, differ materially from the then prevailing stamp of a country grammar school. The range of school studies was far smaller than it is now, the pressure of examinations less; but more time and opportunity were afforded for study out of school and for self-development, and of this Temple took the fullest advantage. In the present tendency to overcrowd the scholastic time-table, it may be opportune to remember

Temple's testimony to the value of giving boys greater freedom for independent work. 'You may depend upon it' (he said in 1870) 'there is a real and special value in this throwing a boy on his own resources . . . I must confess that I have a love for the old Grammar School system.'

Six months sufficed to carry Temple through the lower school, and in three years he rose to the class of monitors, and finally won the scholarship to Balliol when only sixteen and a half years old. He had made his mark by his extraordinary physical vigour, by his genius for friendship (one comrade of those schoolboy days remained a fast friend for over sixty years), by his absolute fidelity to duty, by his unswerving love of truth. The one remaining obstacle to his entrance upon college life was overcome by a timely and anonymous gift of 50*l.* Can we wonder that it was providentially forthcoming: the Master had need of him?

The boy had made his mark, and 'prophecies went before on' him—one of them sufficiently striking to be recorded. On the day he won the Balliol scholarship, Temple was overtaken by one of the school trustees, who said, 'I cannot say what you are going to be, but this I am sure of: that if you live long enough you will be one of the greatest men in England.' It was only after many years that Temple mentioned this, adding, 'How I walked on air as I went home!—and now that success has come I do not care for it.'

Life at the university was one protracted struggle maintained with unflinching determination, with unwearied assiduity, and with unruffled cheerfulness. The Oxford Movement was deeply affecting the intellectual and spiritual atmosphere around him when Temple went into residence at Balliol in April 1839, and was brought into close personal contact with W. G. Ward and with Tait as his college tutors; but although his letters shew that he was deeply interested, he felt that preparation for the Schools was the duty of the day, and he would not be diverted from it by other subjects, however intrinsically important. His application was really prodigious. A fortnight after going up he wrote to his mother:

'I begin work at five o'clock, and work till three, which includes also being in chapel, breakfast, and lectures. I then go out till dinner-time, which is at four, and after dinner till chapel time, which is at half-past five. After the chapel service is over I walk about in the garden, or get anything I want in the town till about 7 or 6.30, and then go to work again till I go to bed' (vol. i. p. 39, note 1).

This was no mere flash in the pan, for two and a half years later he writes: 'I have been up the last week and more and dressed by four, sometimes by three, without any fatigue and without even an alarm to awake me.'

It was equally characteristic of the man, too, that whilst obliged to exercise the most rigid economy—his annual expenditure being under 90*l.*—he devoted the whole proceeds (7*l.*) of a college prize to buying books for his younger brother then sailing for India; and that when out of his scanty means he was materially helping his mother, he still rendered her yearly a minute account of how every penny of his income was spent.

The first chapter of the Editor's supplement, headed 'Development'—fills as many pages as the first section of this biography by compartments, but adds little to the fullness of Canon Wilson's portraiture of Temple's earlier years. So far as his inner mind is revealed—and it is laid bare unreservedly in his correspondence with his mother—Temple highly honoured the personal piety of the leaders of the Oxford Movement; he came under their influence, but, although he learnt much from them, was never an adherent of the Movement. His own standpoint was thoroughly reasoned out, and is expressed with singular lucidity in a letter which we regard as most remarkable, when we remember that it was written at twenty-two years of age by a man whose whole time had been absorbed in the enormous toil by which he won his 'double first,' that his great success at Oxford had inevitably made him conscious of his powers, that he could not have failed to realize that his mother's range of knowledge was much more contracted than his own, and that her direction to cease discussion of so intensely interesting a question was so hard to obey that he had

mildly remonstrated, 'I do not think you know what you are requiring of me.' Necessity of space constrains some condensation in the following quotation :

'One thing I always feel: the more I read the Bible the more I see the reason of what I read; I see the doctrines are not only true because there, but also in themselves; and at the same time things take new lights, and I see what I never saw before. Surely there is but little thought in the land; meditation on God's truth is a practice almost lost among us; we are content to be Christians in the Church,—and not always there. We are content to hold on trust what surely we were intended to make our own. St. Paul evidently does not contemplate this deference to authority, so essential in the beginning, as likewise final: even he, an inspired Apostle, would not claim dominion over the faith of his converts. Shall we, who merely rest on *our own* interpretation of that inspiration, claim what he refused? . . . Those perhaps are happiest who have never had doubt put into their heads; but that is not granted to the Church now; we must win by prayer, meditation, and obedience what our want of union has lost. I will only say one thing more: that I have really tried to be careful of my speech, and have not yet, I believe, in any way broken your commands. I mention it lest, because I have spoken freely, you should think I was not so careful to be obedient' (vol. i. pp. 69, 70).

The five years which followed Temple's election to a fellowship at Balliol were eventful in his personal history. They were filled with a wide range of study, theological, educational, and political, and were the period in which his convictions were gradually and determinately consolidated. He had been at one time somewhat attracted by Romanism, especially by the importance of the confessional as a means of instructing the ignorant, by the deeper interest (as he conceived) shewn in the condition of the poor in mediæval as compared with modern times, and by the energy and self-sacrifice of the Roman priesthood in contrast with the worldliness of many of the Anglican clergy. The catastrophe of Newman and Ward dissipated these tendencies, and he fell largely under the influence of the Liberal reaction which was the result of the great secession to Rome. The Chartist movement, the Irish famine,

the abuses of child labour, the condition of the poor, all affected him, and he became detached from his old political Tory creed as well as from the religious standpoint of his early days. He was deeply stirred by the need for national education, whilst he felt that 'to educate without reforming is sure to produce revolution.' The condition of the nation was really alarming, and Temple visited Holland, Germany, and Switzerland, besides spending some time in the *ouvrier* quarter of Paris, to gather knowledge bearing upon social problems. A variety of intellectual pursuits helped to train and quicken his mental activity. He studied Kant and the scholastic philosophy, he engaged with Jowett in a translation of Hegel's 'Logic,' he projected some papers on St. Thomas Aquinas, he was eager in the advocacy of university reform. But in the conflict of religious opinion raging on all sides of him, one which necessarily influenced his thought, his mind had become sufficiently settled to induce him to take Holy Orders, and as his thought ripened his more serious convictions were strengthened. 'The self-government of a free conscience was the rock on which both the theology and the politics of his future years were to stand,' and it was at this period that he made his own and learned to live by his conception of faith as 'the joint product of enlightenment of the intellect, conviction of the conscience, and action of the will.'

Important as were the nine years, from May 1, 1848, to the end of 1857, which Temple spent in the public service under the Committee of Council on Education, the section devoted to them in these *Memoirs* is rather heavy reading. Temple was in turn examiner in the Education Office, Principal of Kneller Hall, a training college for workhouse schoolmasters, and Inspector of Training Colleges—all posts of responsibility whilst plans for national elementary education were still immature, but not of much interest to the general reader. The story of college and university reform, and of the drastic changes wrought as the result of the Schools Inquiry Commission, might prompt us to ask whether experience has justified the sweeping disregard of the intentions of pious founders and the modifi-

cation of religious trusts to suit modern theories. Half a century ago the religious difficulty, the consequence and the curse of our miserable divisions, was with us, and was producing its inevitable fruit of educational strife; and in his unfamiliarity with the actualities of parochial life Temple was disposed to concede more to Nonconformist clamour than he thought judicious in later years.

Dr. Goulburn's resignation of the head mastership of Rugby in 1857 made a vacancy of which Temple had said, when refusing to stand for it eight years before, that there was no post on earth he would so much like to fill. It would be hard to surpass the testimonials which secured his election, but with characteristic self-control he never even read them. He arrived at the schoolhouse in most unconventional fashion, carrying his own bag and clad in a swallow-tail dress-coat; but masters and boys alike quickly realized that a ruling spirit of no ordinary power had been set over them. The new head master was in the prime of life, having just completed his thirty-sixth year, equally vigorous in mind and body, a match for the foremost at football or cricket and an all-round scholar in classics, divinity, history, and mathematics.

Into his new sphere of work Temple threw himself with almost incredible energy. He set himself the task of reading through all the classical authors that ever enter into a school curriculum. He reviewed the entire scope of the school work and arranged plans for wider opportunities for mathematics and music and science. He reorganized the classes by arranging them in parallel sections under different tutors so that a boy's progress upwards should not be unduly delayed. Above all, he gave his assistant masters exceptional freedom in the discussion of school questions, although it was seldom that their objections to his own proposals had not been foreseen or did not melt away before the indomitable strength of his will. The masters' meetings were, as one of them reminded him—in a letter which Temple himself printed and circulated—only 'a council of suggestions,' and his despotism was beneficent but unlimited. And despite all his persistency

and the unrelenting stimulus to exertion which he impressed on both colleagues and boys, he gradually but surely won their enthusiastic and unbounded attachment.

It needed mind and character of no ordinary calibre thus to dominate the splendid staff which supported the head of Rugby. It was not merely the power of teaching, nor the scholarship, nor the ideal head master: it was the grand personality of the man which compelled their obedience and affection. Soon Temple's commanding position became acknowledged far beyond the school life of Rugby. As the Editor of the *Memoirs* writes:

'The fame spread abroad. The Headmaster's services were required on Education Commissions, and he became the leading spirit and chief authority upon them; his methods were recognized as the best educational methods of the day. Members of the Rugby staff were chosen as the headmasters of other schools; some were called to be chiefs of old schools which had a reputation to maintain; some were set to model new schools upon the lines which they had learned at Rugby. Bradley went to Marlborough College, Benson to Wellington, Arthur Butler to Haileybury, Jex Blake to Cheltenham, Percival to Clifton, Charles Evans to King Edward's School at Birmingham, Kitchener to Newcastle, Phillpotts to Bedford; Scotland asked for Potts as the head of Fettes College' (vol. ii. p. 591).

Who can measure the results of Temple's influence thus spread broadcast over the rising generation of England's manhood? The magnetic power of the man—so grim and abrupt as he was occasionally, so intolerant of pretence and unreality, so terribly unsparing in questions of duty and conscience—lay in the conviction he inspired at all times of his own absolute sincerity and truthfulness. His daily life, on which the fiercest light of criticism was turned by those keenest of all critics, sixth-form scholars and subaltern-masters, bore the trying test magnificently, and no wonder. Shrewd common sense and great intellectual ability, sanctified by faith and prayer, supply an impregnable foundation on which to build esteem.

It was in the religious daily life and the religious teaching that the secret of Temple's influence lay. 'His lessons

on the Bible,' writes Mr. Kitchener, 'were an epoch in the education of the Sixth. They were not made to take the place of his chapel teaching, but they were a revelation of what the Bible really was, and gave to the study of the Old and New Testaments a new reverence and a new hope.' The preparation of the boys for the annual Confirmation, and the Saturday evenings before Holy Communion, were times of special opportunity; and we have a graphic picture of the boys trooping into chapel, hot and excited, in their football dress, and after a few short and appropriate prayers lending themselves to the preacher's soul-stirring words. To Temple's mind there was an intimate connection between strong, vigorous exercise and healthy-mindedness. He had an intense dread of morbid religious sentimentality. 'I should not venture,' he said of his Holy Week sermons, 'to preach those sermons if it were not for the playground.'

We must crave space for a single quotation as illustrating the inmost heart of the preacher, and the effect he produced on his hearers.

'No one indeed could listen,' writes Mr. Arthur Butler, 'to his sermons, in which a strong and noble nature so passionately pleaded for what was right, dear to God and good for man, without being deeply moved by them. The effect of them cannot be judged by merely reading them. It was the warm soul of a strong man speaking in the name of his Master (often with tears flowing down his cheeks), with the naturally somewhat harsh voice softened and vibrating with emotion, which stirred his young hearers like a trumpet call. I have heard some old Rugbeians speak of them in a way that would sound to many an exaggeration. I have never heard any one question their universal influence' (vol. i. pp. 216, 217).

It is easy to imagine the sensation caused in the school when the storm burst upon the publication of *Essays and Reviews*. Temple's first care was to set himself right with the sixth-form and his assistant masters, and then to abide without flinching the opprobrium which his contribution to the book involved. Into the merits of this now forgotten controversy it is unnecessary to enter;

but it naturally caused much apprehension amongst parents of the Rugby boys and deeply pained some of Temple's most intimate friends. The line of conduct which he adopted and persisted in, despite the earnest entreaties of many whose affection he highly prized, will be variously estimated, but those who are most disposed to regret his tardy withdrawal (and we confess that we incline to that side on a review of all the circumstances fully set before us in these *Memoirs*) will do well to remember the verdict of a judge at once so competent and so impartial as Dr. Lightfoot :

' Temple's earliest acts and words, as a Bishop, inspire great hope. To my mind he has acted most nobly about *Essays and Reviews*—courageous in refusing to withdraw his name when it was clamorously demanded, and not less courageous in withdrawing it now when the withdrawal will expose him to the criticism of his advanced friends' (vol. i. p. 305).

The only way in which Temple, on the first outburst of clamour against *Essays and Reviews*, attempted publicly to vindicate his orthodoxy, was by publishing a volume of his Rugby school sermons which he insisted should appear just as they had been preached ; but the strain told heavily even upon his iron frame. Although he was not given to self-defence, the accusations freely hurled at him must have been intensely painful to one who could write in all sincerity, ' I would gladly sacrifice any other aim, if by so doing I could help any of my pupils to live in the spirit of the Bible and to love the Lord Jesus Christ.' He was not a great letter-writer like Creighton, and had not the leisure for manifesting his interest in young people in this special fashion ; indeed, the daily charge of Rugby was a sufficiently exhausting burden ; but he gladly continued intimate relations with the sixth-form boys after they had left school, and the following letter will illustrate the pains he would bestow to help in developing the minds of his more thoughtful pupils. The quotation, which we are compelled to abbreviate, is of exceptional importance as indicating a most suggestive line of thought

which Temple afterwards worked out more fully in his Bampton Lectures :

'The analogies of physical science cannot penetrate into the spiritual kingdom. . . . It follows, therefore, that no difficulty raised by physical science can interfere with prayer for spiritual blessings to be bestowed either on yourself or on others. God has not made any revelation of a determined course of action in this matter. We never can feel that we are asking Him to set aside a rule of His own government here. A man must have philosophised away his wits before he can say science proves that my conduct is under a fixed law, and it is therefore useless to pray God to help me to alter it.

'But more than this follows.

'For all that part of physical phenomena which is capable of being affected by human action, is *pro tanto* taken out of the mechanical dominion of law.

'Let us suppose that the weather in England can be affected by some man lighting a fire and burning down a huge forest in South America.

'Let us suppose that the spread of an epidemic is affected by the conduct of men in dealing with it.

'Let us suppose that the energy of the farmers has an effect on the crops. . . .

'In all these cases it is obvious that the phenomena are taken away from the *absolute* dominion of law, and are so far no longer the subjects of a revelation that God will only act in one way.

'Every man must determine for himself how far this will carry him. I am convinced that we are meant to pray for spiritual blessings, and that by prayer we get them. I shrink from praying for other blessings except in a very general way. But the above remark is enough to show that others besides spiritual blessings *may*, in the present state of science, be possibly the proper matter of prayer on the part of those who do not feel so deeply impressed as I do by the tendency of science to subordinate all physical phenomena to law' (vol. ii. pp. 596, 597).

The Exeter episcopate presents at the outset a transition from the dignified but distant rule of the old-fashioned inaccessible prelate to the stirring energy of the modern ideal of a Father-in-God in daily touch with the pastors and people committed to his charge. Large arrears of work had almost

inevitably accumulated, even under the vigorous administration of Henry Phillpotts, when protracted through eight-and-thirty years and wielded over a diocese of which the extremity was 140 miles from the cathedral city. A fresh spirit had to be infused into every branch of Church work, if it was to advance satisfactorily; for there had been little love in the rule of the late bishop and no reconciling power. Under such conditions differences had not been softened, but accentuated, and Churchmen needed to be united by the bond of common action in their Master's cause. The difficulties of the position were also seriously augmented by the circumstances of Temple's entrance upon the see. He was regarded with suspicion by many of those to whom he had to look for information, counsel, and support. Nearly half the cathedral staff were hostile. Many of the rural deaneries had memorialized against him. All the forces of self-satisfied inertia were prepared to resent with more or less of passive resistance any attempt to quicken them to greater energy. Besides these hindrances, the new bishop's abruptness of manner and directness of speech were widely misunderstood, and in some quarters gave serious offence. Yet Temple was not disheartened. He had a genius for detachment, was accustomed to stand alone, and had the confidence in himself which springs from the consciousness of singleness and loftiness of purpose. 'If I once get amongst them,' he wrote, 'I have very little doubt of winning them.'

On a broad review of the 'Exeter Memoir' we are specially impressed with Temple's clear grasp of details in the vast variety of subjects, lay and ecclesiastical, with which he was required to deal. Nothing was too insignificant for him, as nothing was too important, which could minister to the welfare of the workers or the work. The cure of a smoking chimney or the question of an incumbent's fees, the settlement of some obscure point of Church law or the definition of the relations to be maintained with Nonconformists—in short, all or any of the thousand questions, trivial or critical, which fill the episcopal postbag were promptly determined. Temple had that invariable quality

of a great administrator, a due sense of the importance of little things. His insistence upon them was even, it may be, occasionally excessive. And the same rich variety of experience, of knowledge, and of sympathy was brought to light in his intercourse with all classes of the laity, whose hearts were further gained when he claimed kith and kinship for many generations with Cornwall as well as long and loving acquaintance with the whole countryside of North Devon.

If we turn to another section of Temple's work as a bishop, how admirable is his advice to the clergy, whether given at ruridecanal gatherings or Quiet Days, in Visitation charges, or, chiefest of all, at Ordinations. On such primary matters as study or reading prayers or preaching one might gather a brief manual of instruction for the younger clergy which would be of exceptional value. He is so simple, so direct, so forcible, and withal so acute in his analysis of spiritual forces. How admirably, for example, in the two following brief extracts, he explains, first, why uneducated persons value preaching so highly, and, secondly, the special usefulness of expository sermons :

'Less educated persons can learn, and do learn, a great deal from sermons. They get new knowledge, new thoughts, new methods of thought ; and they get all this in the best possible way, that is, unconsciously. The people, as a rule, find a sermon more to them than the prayers, and that is not caused by any self-indulgent desire to seek what pleases them. It is the free judgment of their spiritual experience. They are not at the intellectual level at which prayers, except very short and specific prayers, can give them the help which they can get from good teaching in the form of sermons' (vol. i. p. 434).

In advocating the devotion of time and study to preparation for expository sermons, he says :

'Our best and most religious people are hungry for knowledge of the Bible. The more education spreads and people can read for themselves, the more do they want to understand that book. It is in attacking that book that sceptics attack religion. It is in explaining that book that teachers make the deepest impressions—false teachers in spreading error, and true

teachers in building men up with the truth. The deeply religious, the inquiring, the unhappy, the perplexed, they all go to the Bible for what they want. We can hardly do anything, I doubt if we *can* do anything, for our people to be compared with helping them to understand the Bible; and sermons especially directed to that end will fall in with their need better than almost any other sermons' (*ib.* pp. 434, 435).

How minute and suggestive Temple's addresses were is well illustrated in his remarks on reading in church. He vindicated insistence upon matters which might seem of comparatively little consequence by reminding his hearers 'We are serving God. In His service all things that help forward our great mission are of importance.' The reading should be loud enough: this is necessary for uneducated people; many of the younger generation of clergy are faulty in this respect. Right pitch of voice, management of breath, speed, distinct articulation especially of the consonants, all require attention; and as it is not easy to know one's defects, the aid of a candid critic should be secured. After the physical conditions the intellectual and spiritual qualifications of good reading are discussed:

'Our first duty is to worship ourselves, not only to lead the devotions of others. Prayers ought not be said to the people, but to God: characteristic of such reading is reverence and humility, which will be there, if in the heart first. We should be conscious of the presence of others who are joining with us in prayers. In the lessons we are speaking to the people; we must always try to make the people feel that the lessons are God's Word; remember it is a message from God, and then read in a natural way.' . . . In conclusion: 'take care of small details of the service. "The Lord be with you" is, perhaps, not thought of enough, as a change in the service. The human voice is intended to reach the heart' (vol. i. p. 438).

No doubt Temple had, like other men, the defects of his qualities, and at times in his anxiety not to omit any minor point he laboured the obvious and addressed well-instructed men as though they were advanced schoolboys. We recollect a long and wearisome harangue to the members of a rural deanery in the West-end of London, mainly composed

of highly educated and experienced incumbents, which left a mingled feeling of amusement and irritation as well as the sense that a valuable opportunity had been wasted. It was singular, too, that one who had so keen an insight into the importance of trifles should not have taken pains to modify a brusqueness of manner which sometimes caused unnecessary pain. 'I won't' was his whole and sole reply to the most dignified of the metropolitan clergy, who approached him, on behalf of the East-end incumbents, with the request that he would for once only modify arrangements which caused widespread inconvenience. No wonder that rural deans stood aloof and declined to convey to him the wishes of their assembled chapters through fear of being snubbed.

It was fortunate when the humorous side of an interview presented itself. At an early (if not the first) meeting to which the rural deans of London were summoned, the dignified conscript fathers assembled at London House and were ushered into a barely furnished room. Presently the bishop arrived. 'Sit down' was his brief salutation, and he then began to call over their names like a class at school. It was too funny, and they all burst into laughter in which the bishop himself heartily joined.

Such minor blemishes only serve to bring out into stronger relief Temple's sterling qualities. It was in his dealing with candidates for Ordination and in the conduct of Quiet Days for the clergy that the passionate fervour and intensity of the bishop's character were revealed. Most heart-searching were the questions put to those who presented themselves for Holy Orders. The solemnity of the engagement, in itself absolutely ir retrievable; the need to remember that it was not merely selecting a profession, but asserting the conviction of a divine call; the imperative demand that there should be unreserved surrender of their own will to God's will; the subordination of all else in order to advance God's Word in that particular spot which was assigned to their ministry—were all urged with unsparing plainness. 'Would you be ordained if you had 50,000*l.* a year?' was the query suddenly propounded on one occasion. In his

mouth the word was indeed quick and powerful, piercing to the dividing asunder of the joints and marrow.

'There is one condition,' he urged in his first Ordination sermon, 'before any man can deliver his message' as an ambassador for Christ; 'it is, first, that he should have had it delivered to his own soul. Unless the message has within that reality which only comes from its being a real part of your own life, a great deal of what you are saying must inevitably be words, and nothing else. . . . If there be any truth that you are setting forth, of which it is possible for you to say, "Had it been untrue I should have been just the same as I am," then depend upon it such a belief as that is not a belief that would enable you to impress the truth upon your people—it is not a belief that will enable you to be a real ambassador of Christ to deliver that message. Spiritual teaching must be backed up by truth of life, or else it loses its power' (vol. i. p. 408).

We make no apology for these extracts, because they serve to shew us the man to his heart's core. Insistence upon so lofty a standard prompts the question whether the speaker's own life corresponded to the ideal he upheld. Shall we try it by a crucial test? Two outstanding events in the Exeter episcopate afforded an opportunity for lavish self-sacrifice, and they were promptly seized. When the Education Act of 1870 was passed, Temple instantly realized the importance of taking advantage of the year of grace allowed to bring the Church schools of the diocese up to the required standard. It was the first year of his episcopate: there was much to be done, and no time to be lost; at least 5,000*l.* was required. 'This is a big matter' (he said), 'and we must move at once. I will give 500*l.*; what will you give?' The great men of the diocese hesitated: they did not know what would follow such rapid action: but the money was raised and the schools were saved. When he left Exeter fifteen years later the schools were stronger and more numerous than when he came to it.

The division of the diocese was a more laborious question which had been mooted twenty years before Temple's consecration, but had only hitherto interested a few ardent churchmen and had been started upon lines that could not

command success. The history of the movement for the revival of the ancient Cornish see and its happy consummation through the munificence of Lady Rolle are well known, but it was through Temple's own large-hearted generosity that her donation of 40,000*l.* was promptly secured. He insisted on immediately surrendering 500*l.* per annum from his own official income. The new see was established with marvellous celerity, and Temple's satisfaction was complete when Benson was set over it. The intimacy thus renewed was continued through life, Benson constantly asking for advice and Temple never weary of responding. 'I don't feel able to stir without you,' wrote the younger man, and none could better appreciate than the elder how admirably his work had been crowned. He was not giving utterance to any superficial flattery when, at the new Bishop of Truro's enthronement, he said :

'I may be pardoned, even in his presence, if I express to you how deeply I feel the value to this part of the English Church of the services of such a man as I know my friend to be. I have known him for nearly twenty years with ever-increasing intimacy. I have known him and worked with him as a brother. A scholar of the very first rank, a man of the very widest reading, a man of the most genial sympathies, and, above all, one who gives his heart to our Lord and Master as few men are able to do it' (vol. i. p. 402).

Archdeacon Sandford seems a little apprehensive that Benson's brilliancy and fascination, and the consequent glamour that was shed around his episcopate, may tend to cast into shadow Temple's exertions which had laid the foundation of a revived diocese and made a yet greater revival possible.

Sixteen years of indefatigable and ever-increasing labour had fully earned the one recognition which Temple would most highly esteem—viz., a call to yet heavier work and enlarged responsibility. His biographer not unnaturally laments that he was not promoted to the primacy on the death of Archbishop Tait, but with characteristic self-abnegation, Temple cordially endorsed Benson's appointment. Three years later, when he succeeded Bishop Jackson,

he brought to the hardly less important see of London not only the prestige won by intense force of character and power to sway great masses of men, but the recognized position of the archbishop's most trusted counsellor and the most statesmanlike prelate of the Southern Province.

It is impossible within the space at our command to discuss even the exceptional incidents of Temple's London episcopate and his tenure of the primacy. Some of these, such as the 'Opinions' on Incense and Reservation, have been already dealt with in these pages. Needless to say that to the ordinary routine of daily overwhelming engagements Temple not only to the very last brought the energy and ardour that were all his own, but that he realized more fully than any of his predecessors the necessities of the see of London, and, whilst insisting on a personal share in the superintendence of the whole diocese, made ampler provision for its effectual episcopal supervision by securing the appointment of additional suffragans. We must confine ourselves to some notice of his treatment of diversity of religious conviction, whether it took the form of ritualism or of broader churchmanship, of his special devotion to the temperance question, and of his conduct of the Lambeth Conference of 1897.

In dealing with disputed matters of ritual, Temple was at once too tolerant, too strong, and too just to be hurried into fussy or premature action. He was persuaded that in restraining excesses more reliance was to be placed on fatherly persuasion than on legislative enactments; that it was worse than folly to commence prosecutions which generally evoked sympathy with the defendants and frequently proved that the bishop had no practical coercive power; and that hardly any sacrifice was too great in order to carry conscience along with his decisions. We cannot describe his policy or its consequences more concisely than Archdeacon Sandford has done in the following passage:

'Temple's chief fears were not in the excesses themselves, mischievous as he held them to be, but in what might come of them. He saw the risk of alienating the mass of thoughtful

religious laymen on the one hand, and of throwing the general body of loyal High Churchmen into joint action with the extreme men by any appearance of injustice, on the other. Therefore he walked slowly, and he did not expect a speedy end to the journey; but all the time he knew the way. A mind and will were behind his steady steps. The policy of dealing with Ritualism here indicated was followed to the end of Dr. Temple's life, and in one respect it failed. Consisting not in drastic measures, but in influence and right training, it required patient and continuous attention to individual cases, and this he did not give . . . if the business was uncongenial, or the point to be decided difficult, action was not always prompt. . . . Ritualism was not to be hunted down, but individual law-breakers needed to be followed up; for the most part they were merely passed by, and some of them went on breaking the law still more' (vol. i. pp. 591-2).

Temple strongly objected to prosecutions for ritualism on the motion of independent associations or any other than genuinely aggrieved parishioners, yet the only case in which he exercised his episcopal veto was in the attack made upon the new reredos at St. Paul's. One of his most terrific snubs was a reply to a lengthy and impertinent letter from the chairman of the Church Association, which ran: 'The Bishop of London is much obliged by being informed of the view which Captain Cobham takes of the duty of a Bishop.' The St. Paul's reredos case, eventually carried to the House of Lords, singularly vindicated Temple's legal acumen and established the bishop's veto 'on a firmer basis than its warmest advocates had hitherto ventured to assign to it.'

Temple's own theological position had been early worked out, and was consistently maintained. Whilst agreeing in many respects with the Liberal school of theology, he retained a high appreciation of Christian dogmatics, which with enlarged experience and increased responsibilities grew stronger, and he urged, in terms peculiarly appropriate to the educational controversy now raging, the imperative necessity for definite religious teaching. His speech in Convocation (May 11, 1897) is well worthy of reproduction at the present time. No one had fuller

acquaintance with the question or could weigh it more impartially, but his condemnation of undenominationalism is emphatic. 'The religious teaching,' he concludes, 'if it is not really definite in most people's minds, fades away altogether into nothing which lays hold of the learner's heart and conscience' (vol. ii. p. 674).

Any review of Temple's life would be strangely incomplete which omitted all mention of his persistent advocacy of temperance. On no social question, perhaps, has a more signal change passed over public opinion. Half a century ago this subject held only a subordinate place in the concern of the clergy, and it was seriously hindered by the intemperate language with which the duty of total abstinence was frequently insisted on. It is impossible to determine how largely the altered attitude of the Church is due to Temple's unwearied and judicious exertions. Although he realized as few men could the national danger and degradation of drinking habits, and in consequence was ready to work heart and soul with the Rechabites and other extremists, he never used their fanatical language; he was always prepared to accept any instalment of temperance reform that could be carried through Parliament; he was absolutely impartial in shewing favour to those who did not, as to those amongst the clergy who did, join in the anti-drink crusade; but on all occasions he urged the necessity for prompt action. 'The hereditary character of a great deal of drunkenness,' he pleaded, 'lays a heavy responsibility on those who are postponing all attempts to remedy it.' To many minds it appeared incongruous that the primate, overburdened with age and the care of all the Anglican Churches, should be taking long and exhausting journeys to deliver temperance addresses; to himself it was the surest of convictions that the last remains of waning strength could not be better spent.

It was a bold stroke when Lord Salisbury, on the sudden death of Archbishop Benson, offered the vacant primacy to a man of seventy-five years of age; but Temple had been the late archbishop's constant and intimate adviser to a degree of which the outside world was but little

aware, and he felt that he would come to the charge with full knowledge of all that it involved. There is something intensely pathetic in the record of the two friends, so strongly contrasted and so closely united, directing, in absolute concord and also in comparative isolation, the immense machinery of the Anglican Church throughout the world; and then, through the calling up higher of the younger, the more aged of the pair is required to bear the burden alone. Benson had been wont to say that the Primate of All England needed a cardinalate with which to hold counsel on intricate Church questions: isolation of mind was the characteristic note of Temple, and in the most responsible of crises he was fully content to stand alone. The Bishop of Bristol, the biographer in these volumes of Temple's primacy, questions whether this detachment and the dominance of will over physical fatigue were not injurious to the highest interests of Temple's unique position; however that may be, they were soon brought into high relief. Within six months of his enthronement at Canterbury, Temple had to preside over the fourth Lambeth Conference, at which nearly 200 bishops attended, and his conduct of the assembly was masterly. At its close 'the summary of the resolutions arrived at was drafted entirely by himself, in the course of a night, without consultation with any one. With but slight exceptions it was accepted,' and published as the Encyclical Letter. A noble sermon from the Primate at St. Paul's formed a fitting conclusion to the Conference, and a present of gold sacramental vessels from the American bishops testified to the warm personal affection for him which their brief acquaintance had inspired.

The closing scenes of the Archbishop's life, the indefatigable exertions despite increasing weakness, the long and wearisome journeys to Wales, to Scotland, to Bradford and Nottingham and Bristol and Hereford, the touching ceremony of the Coronation, the last struggle of the indomitable will in the House of Lords, are all still vividly present to our memories. His predominant interests animated him to the end; 'The last sermon of his life, preached on his

eighty-second birthday in Canterbury Cathedral, November 30, 1902, was on foreign missions, even as, by striking coincidences, the last completed speech of his life was on temperance and the last words he uttered in public were on education.'

It has been said that the tendency of modern civilization is to produce men of one uniform pattern, with all their angles carefully smoothed down and all individuality effectually obliterated. Amidst such a generation Temple stands out in high relief. His character was markedly simple and strong, and calls for no subtle analysis. Rugged, self-sacrificing, tender, true, he is a subject in his massive grandeur fit for the chisel of a Michel Angelo. Of course, he had his limitations, and he knew them; but few lives indeed could bear like his the most searching assay and produce so large a proportion of purest gold. From childhood right through to fourscore years his consistent motto was 'Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might.' Absolutely unspoiled by success, and mellowing with advancing years, his *Memoirs* present a marvellous combination of exceptional detachment and abounding sympathy. His greatness consists in the devotion of all his great powers of intellect and heart and will to the everyday duties of life. His name is one that should be long retained in the memory of churchmen when they praise God's Holy Name for all His servants departed this life in His faith and fear.

ART. III.—THE NEW TESTAMENT IN COPTIC.

The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect, otherwise called Memphitic and Bohairic. With Introduction, Critical Apparatus, and Literal English Translation. [By the Rev. GEORGE HORNER, M.A., formerly rector of Mells, Somerset.] Four Volumes. (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1898-1905.)

I.

AN edition of the New Testament in the Bohairic dialect of Coptic has long been recognized as a very necessary but,

at the same time, a most arduous undertaking. It is true that several scholars in the past, notably Wilkins (1716), Schwartze (1846), and Boetticher, better known as De Lagarde (1852), have applied themselves to the task, but none of them was able to bring it to a successful conclusion. The principal difficulty lay in turning to the best account the manuscript material available; for the codices which have preserved for us the Bohairic New Testament are, comparatively speaking, very late, and in any case centuries later than the translator's original manuscript. The result is that all the manuscripts are more or less corrupt, and the student who wishes to get back to the original must, if possible, compare them all and thence reconstruct the oldest form of text. This is, as might be expected, an enormous undertaking; to accomplish it implies great patience, perseverance, and self-denial; and a deep debt of gratitude is therefore due to the scholar—the Rev. George Horner—who has taken this labour upon himself with a large measure of success. Mr. Horner's achievement is the more noteworthy, since simultaneously with the publication of the Bohairic New Testament he has also completed a second work, which had long been similarly regarded till then as an endless task: he has edited the Æthiopic and the Arabic texts of the so-called *Canones Ecclesiastici*, together with an English translation of the Copto-Sahidic and the Copto-Bohairic version of this 'Church-Order.'¹

In a survey of the sum-total of what Mr. Horner has accomplished in his Bohairic New Testament three principal features present themselves which must, in our opinion, be accounted distinctive merits of his edition. In the first place, anyone who has busied himself with Coptic manuscripts will already have become unpleasantly aware that Coptic palæography lies as yet in its infancy, and is a much neglected study. It is true that facsimiles from Coptic

¹ *The Statutes of the Apostles, or Canones Ecclesiastici*. Edited with Translation and Collation from Ethiopic and Arabic MSS.; also a Translation of the Saidic and Collation of the Bohairic Versions; and Saidic fragments. (London: Williams & Norgate, 1904.)

manuscripts are now being published in large numbers, and in this connection special mention must be made of M. Henri Hyvernat's great *Album de Paléographie copte*, and of the edition of the Sahidic Biblical texts in the Vatican which Ciasca and Balestri have produced. But it is impossible to say that the material which these three scholars have rendered generally accessible, has been worked over in a scientific manner. At the present day Coptic palæography is still as uncertain as it was a generation ago, and even now it is a not unknown occurrence for various Coptic students to differ from one another in the dating of a manuscript by no less than five centuries. We notice, therefore, with the greater pleasure that Mr. Horner has prefixed to his edition precise palæographical descriptions of the manuscripts which he has investigated—and he has inspected probably all the manuscripts which could be of service in any way whatever for his purpose. It is unfortunate that no facsimiles are added, but we ought not perhaps to reproach the editor for this, since the addition would probably have made the work very costly. At all events Mr. Horner endeavours by the plainness of his descriptions to supply the loss entailed by the absence of reproductions of the manuscripts. These descriptions are the more valuable since various Bohairic Biblical manuscripts bear a date, and thus furnish fixed landmarks in Coptic palæography. But this description of the manuscripts is of service not only for the expert in palæography but for the historical student generally in the widest sense of the word. For example, Mr. Horner has not thought it too much trouble to turn his attention to a point which most scholars have hitherto passed over without heed—viz. the prayers which the scribes have appended to their manuscripts, sometimes in Bohairic, sometimes in Arabic. These especially are of extreme interest from the point of view of the history of culture. Sooner or later the history of Christian piety will no doubt have to be written, and for the writer who sets himself this task the prayers referred to will be of great importance. A systematic examination of these prayers is unfortunately still wanting, but for such

an undertaking Mr. Horner has supplied a very valuable preliminary study.

A second merit of this work consists in the fact that the editor has made a full comparison of the majority—and those the most important—of the MSS. which he inspected, and has rendered them available in the *apparatus criticus*. We frankly confess that in regard to this we cannot repress a feeling of regret. Mr. Horner has used as the basis of his printed text only a single manuscript, marking the divergences of the other manuscripts in the critical apparatus. We know that this method is frequently regarded in Orientalist circles as the only scientific one; in fact, they are no less important authorities than Paul de Lagarde, Ignazio Guidi, and Ludwig Stern who have moved Mr. Horner to avail himself of only a single manuscript as the groundwork of the actual text. We are aware also that for philologists it is very desirable and very instructive to obtain the exact text of a single manuscript with all its peculiarities and all its defects. But, on the other hand, it is also undoubtedly clear that following only *one* manuscript has great disadvantages, especially for anyone who makes use of the Bohairic New Testament for the purposes of New Testament textual criticism. Mr. Horner has no doubt taken care to adopt the oldest manuscript everywhere as his basis; but the oldest manuscript is not always the best, and Mr. Horner has himself noted that even the best manuscripts of the Bohairic New Testament rarely present a uniform text; in one book one manuscript proves superior to the rest, in another a different one. And even the very best manuscripts are not free from errors which are easily emended with the help of otherwise inferior ones. Every scribe, even the most careful, is liable to omissions and repetitions. We could have wished, therefore, that Mr. Horner had not printed a single manuscript as his text, but rather the text which on the basis of all the manuscripts approved itself as the oldest.

It seems to the present writer that a more comprehensive view of the critical apparatus might have been obtained if it had been analyzed into three main divisions. The

manuscripts of the Bohairic New Testament fall undoubtedly, as we will shew later, into three classes. The first of these presents the oldest text—presumably that of Hesychius; the second the latest (the Byzantine *κωνσ*); the third, a mixed text. It would have been a distinct advantage for the textual criticism of the New Testament that these three classes should be separated in the Apparatus. We do not say this by way of censure—it is only a matter of formal treatment—but merely in order to entreat Mr. Horner at some time to consider this question, and perhaps to set out the critical apparatus of the Sahidic New Testament, which he will publish next, in a way which yields its information at a glance.¹ In any case the small criticism which we have just offered will not overthrow the verdict that Mr. Horner has collected the material for the restoration of the oldest text with a completeness hitherto unattained, or indeed even attempted. He has compared one manuscript with another with unequalled industry and a really remarkable amount of patience—extending in fact not only to good manuscripts, but to the inferior and even to the worst. The magnitude of the labour involved may be judged from the fact that for his first two volumes, which contain the four Gospels, Mr. Horner has inspected, and for the most part collated, forty-six manuscripts, to say nothing of smaller fragments. The two concluding volumes are not based upon so many manuscripts, since the Gospels were, of course, far more frequently copied than any other part of the New Testament. But even so the tale of the manuscripts here utilized is considerable enough; it amounts to twenty-one for the Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles, besides three fragments which are here laid under contribution, and to eleven manuscripts containing the Apocalypse. The *apparatus criticus* which

¹ We may venture to call attention to a matter of external appearance. The numerals in the critical apparatus are printed with very small figures, with the result of a considerable waste of time in searching for the readings in a given passage. We trust that in numbering the verses in future large thick type may be selected.

is compiled as the result is almost larger than that which Constantine Tischendorf appended to his great edition of the New Testament. Mr. Horner must be allowed to congratulate himself on having achieved a twofold success by his enormous industry. In the first place we now possess the most trustworthy foundations imaginable from which the oldest text of the Bohairic New Testament can be reconstructed; and in the second place we are now able to establish that the Bohairic New Testament has had as extensive and eventful a textual history as, for example, the Latin and the Syriac.¹ Of this we propose to speak later.

The third merit for which we must praise Mr. Horner's work consists in the English translation which he has added to the text. It is true that this translation suffers under the same disadvantage as the text which stands by it; for the editor invariably translates the text which he has printed—i.e. the actual words of a single manuscript with all its blunders, omissions, and repetitions. But the consequences of this mistake do not weigh heavily, since Mr. Horner has felt himself bound to record in the *apparatus criticus*, not only in Coptic but also in English, all important readings which contribute anything either for the sense of the passage or for the retranslation into Greek. As a result it will be rendered possible in most cases even for one who is not an Egyptian scholar to form an opinion for himself as to how the Bohairic version read in any given passage of the New Testament. This is the more easy because Mr. Horner, although he pays regard to the ordinary English Biblical version, translates as literally as the English language can in any way permit. In the Introduction, which contains a Coptic grammar *in nuce*, he gives further a precise account of the fundamental principles which he has observed in his translation—how he has adjusted it to the double form of the Coptic article, how he has reproduced the various different Coptic verbal forms, &c. A very welcome innova-

¹ It is a special cause for gratitude that Mr. Horner has also recorded the Arabic glosses to the manuscripts utilized. These are of the utmost importance for the criticism of the text.

tion has been carried out in Volumes III. and IV., in which, wherever an alien Greek word stands in the Coptic, italics are employed in the English translation. Coptic being written in Greek majuscule script, even a student ignorant of Egyptian is thus able to refer in the Coptic text to the Greek word in question. In this way Mr. Horner has made it possible even for a person who does not understand Coptic to make use of the abundant treasures which he has collected. And further, as regards the availability of the Bohairic Biblical version for purposes of textual criticism, Mr. Horner has also performed a valuable piece of preliminary work by noting in all cases the manuscripts of the Greek text, and the versions, which agree with the Bohairic text or even only with certain Bohairic manuscripts.

To sum up, Mr. Horner's edition of the Bohairic New Testament is a work which, alike in the province of Coptic philology and in that of New Testament textual criticism, marks an epoch. We are the more bound to recognize this since the editor, with an excess of modesty, does not reveal himself on the title-page. The preface to the first volume (page xii) is the only part which he has signed, and even that not with his full name, but simply with the initials G. H.

II.

In order to form a just estimate of the importance of the Bohairic version of the New Testament we must endeavour now to give in a few words a sketch of the way in which a Coptic literature arose. It is a fact which is beyond question that the first Christians in the Nile Valley were not Egyptians in race, but Greeks. The oldest Christian documents with which Egypt furnishes us are Greek in origin; and indeed Christianity must undoubtedly have found a very early entrance among the Greeks of Egypt. Out of what are known as the 'Apostolic Fathers' probably three might at the present day be assigned with confidence to Egypt as their home: the so-called 'Epistle of Barnabas,' since its allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament is clearly Alexandrian; further, the so-called 'Second Epistle of

Clement,' since it makes use of the 'Gospel of the Egyptians,' which, so far as we are aware, was only known in Egypt; and finally, the 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles' or 'Didache,' since the Doxology which is attached to the Lord's Prayer in this writing is identical with the Doxology of the Fayyounm-Coptic and the older Sahido-Coptic Biblical version. The Egyptian origin of these three early Christian writings will further appear from the fact that they were known first and most generally in that country. Clement of Alexandria, for example, regarded the 'Epistle of Barnabas' and the 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles' as Holy Scripture. It may then be considered as certain that there were Hellenist Christians in Egypt undoubtedly at the beginning of the second century, and even at a much earlier date. There is a legend that the Evangelist Mark had preached in Egypt; but at the bottom of the legend lies the undoubtedly genuine fact that there were Christian communities in Egypt soon after Apostolic times.

The Greek Christian communities in Egypt were not long alone. There are speedily indications that Jewish Christian communities must also soon have arisen in Egypt. We know of the existence there about the year 200 A.D. of a Greek translation of the 'Gospel of the Hebrews,' which was the gospel of the Palestinian Jewish Christians. Who but the Jewish Christians of Egypt made use of this translation? To them the original language of the 'Gospel of the Hebrews'—Aramaic—was no longer properly familiar; their service-books must have been written in Greek. But the Greek version of the 'Gospel of the Hebrews' must be older than the year 200 A.D., at which we can for the first time attest it by documentary evidence. It is a fact which admits of no doubt that the title *Gospel of the Egyptians* originated in contrast to the title *Gospel of the Hebrews*. The *Gospel of the Egyptians* was certainly in the earliest times—the time when the so-called 'Second Epistle of Clement' came into being—the gospel of the Hellenist converts from heathenism to Christianity in Egypt in the same measure as the Greek version of the *Gospel of the Hebrews* was the gospel of the Egyptian Jewish-Christians. The

name *Gospel of the Egyptians* must therefore be considerably older than the year 200 A.D.; and consequently the Greek translation of the *Gospel of the Hebrews* must also be older. From this we may conclude, then, that certainly at a very early time, side by side with the Greek Christian communities of converts from heathendom, there arose Jewish-Christian ones as well.

It is quite true that the period during which these Jewish-Christian communities seem really to have flourished was short. Origen knows still the Greek translation of the 'Gospel of the Hebrews': to Eusebius of Cæsarea, on the other hand, whose literary acquisitions were certainly unusually extensive, it was unknown; he makes use of Aramaic manuscripts of the 'Gospel of the Hebrews' as they would have been used by the Palestinian Jewish-Christians of his own time. Hence the Jewish-Christian communities of Egypt must in the course of the third century have become extinct, or—to speak more accurately—have been dissipated in the communities of converts from paganism.

However, this loss—since on the whole we must account it a loss—would have been compensated for by increase from another quarter. Already in the third century there arose the national Egyptian, or, as it is usually called, the Coptic Church.

The first Christian missionaries who visited Egypt naturally spoke the cosmopolitan language—they spoke Greek. Hence they could at the outset win as converts only such men and women as understood Greek, and thus only Egyptian Greeks. If at any time they converted a Copt, it could only be a Copt who understood Greek; and in consequence such a convert naturally attached himself to a Greek-Christian community.

The first real evidence that we have for the existence of Coptic Christians dates from about 250 A.D. It is well known that the persecution of the Christians under the Emperor Decius shewed itself in Egypt with particular severity. The great Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria gives us information with regard to it, and mentions the names of sundry martyrs. Among these occur some pure Coptic

names, such as Bêsa and Amûn.¹ Hence they must probably have been by nationality Egyptians, Copts. Soon after this the hermit Antony of Koma began to achieve a great reputation in Egypt, and he too was a Coptic Christian. We cannot, of course, at present prove that besides *individual* Coptic Christians there were in the third century also undoubtedly Coptic Christian *communities*. But it is at any rate probable. It was well known to the Coptic abbot Shnoodi or Shenoute († 451), whose *floruit* falls at the beginning of the fifth century,² that there lay behind him at least two generations of Coptic Christians and perhaps even more, and that during the time of these two generations important changes had taken place in Coptic Christianity. This information proves that at least at the beginning of the fourth century Coptic Christian communities had grown up, and probably, indeed, even earlier. We are carried back to the same date when we examine the oldest monasteries of Egypt for the nationality of their inmates—the monasteries of Tabennêse and Pbow with their daughter houses. It is an undoubted fact that these monasteries were very often frequented by Greeks; they stood at any rate under the special protection of the great Athanasius of Alexandria. But a further point is also likewise certain; these monasteries were originally founded *for* Copts, as they had also been founded *by* Copts. The founder himself, Pachomius († 346), and his successors, Theodore and Hôrsiêse, were Copts by birth. Two of them bear indisputably Coptic names: Pachomius means ‘the Eagle,’ Hôrsiêse ‘Horus son of Isis.’ Further, the names of the monasteries themselves are Coptic: in the name of the parent monastery of ‘Tabennêse’ is concealed, not, as a copyist of the Church historian and continuator of Eusebius, Hermias Sozomen, conjectured, the Greek *νήσος* (an island), but the name of the Egyptian goddess Isis (in Coptic *Hœs*). And the most important fact of all remains to be noticed—that Pachomius and his successors strove with might and main to prevent their monastery from becoming Hellenized by the large number of Greeks who resorted to it. They

¹ Eus. *H.E.* vi. 41.² Cf. *C.Q.R.* vol. xxvi. July 1888, p. 459f.

enjoined that every novice should undertake as his first task the learning of Coptic. Coptic was the official language in Pachomius' monastery; it was also the language in which the service was conducted. It seems to us certain that, since Pachomius was able to plan and to carry out successfully this Coptic monastic system, there must have been Coptic communities on which he could base himself, and from which he drew the Coptic element for his monastery.

Coptic communities arose first in Upper Egypt. Shenoute, to whom we have referred above, was a native of that district, and the monasteries of Pachomius were essentially Upper Egyptian. This can readily be understood. In Upper Egypt the Greek element was more feebly and the Coptic more strongly represented than in Lower Egypt, with the result that in Upper Egypt the knowledge of Greek was not at all events widely spread. In Lower Egypt the Copts understood for the most part the cosmopolitan Greek language, and thus, on becoming Christians, they could easily join the Greek-Christian communities. In Upper Egypt the position was quite different. When Christianity found an entrance among the Copts of that district there at once presented itself the absolute necessity of founding by the side of the Greek-Christian communities of Upper Egypt Coptic communities in which Coptic would be preached. Hence we can understand also the reason why the first Coptic Biblical versions arose in Upper Egypt—we mean the Sahidic and the Akhmîmic versions.

With regard to the Sahidic version we are tolerably well informed. We possess in this version the New Testament, upon an edition of which Mr. Horner is at present engaged, almost complete; the Old Testament, unfortunately only very incomplete, though Dr. Wallis Budge has published a continuous manuscript of the Psalter. Some few manuscripts are very old: we have, for instance, a manuscript of the Apocalypse of St. John, of the First Epistle of St. John, and of the Epistle to Philemon, which, on palæographical and philological grounds,¹ can

¹ The manuscript presents the oldest Coptic with which we are acquainted.

only have been composed in the fourth century. This manuscript is thus almost as old as the version itself, and indeed the antiquity of this copy makes it probable that the version belongs to the beginning of the fourth century, since it cannot be the original autograph of the translator.

A second observation brings us to the same chronological basis. The letters of Pachomius preserved in Coptic (their genuineness is, we admit, not in all cases entirely certain) quote the Bible according to the Sahidic version. Unfortunately this second observation is not beyond question. The Copts have, as we can prove, 'emended' in very many cases Biblical quotations in older writings according to the 'received' Coptic text of the Bible. When, for example, the Greek *Canones Ecclesiastici* were translated into Coptic the Biblical quotations of this writing were not simply rendered from the Greek text but taken from the Sahidic Bible. Still more instructive are the works of the greatest Sahidic writer, Shenoute. While we have more manuscripts for these works, they nowhere differ from one another so greatly as in the Biblical citations. And, indeed, in this case the differences within the Shenoute manuscripts correspond to the differences within the Sahidic Biblical manuscripts. The Biblical quotations in the much-read writings of Shenoute have been adapted constantly to the current Biblical text of the time. We shall then be on our guard against drawing an altogether positive conclusion from the fact that the Sahidic writings of Pachomius cite the Sahidic Bible in the form which exists at present. But a third observation confirms in some measure the correctness of the conclusion. It is absolutely certain that Shenoute knew the Sahidic version of the Bible; and, as we know, he was abbot of the White Monastery in the district of Akhmîm. The Sahidic version of the Bible, on the other hand, arose, as can be proved on philological grounds, not in this district but further south, in the actual Thebaïs, probably in a monastery of Pachomius. Some delay naturally intervened before the Sahidic Bible spread itself from the Thebaïs to Akhmîm; and we are there-

fore constrained to admit that the Sahidic Bible originated some considerable time before Shenoute. From these considerations we are directed to the first half of the fourth century as a probable date.

It may frankly be conceded that the Sahidic Biblical version *as we have it at present* ought not to be treated as a textual witness dating from the first half of the fourth century. As we have already indicated, it became very much 'corrected' on all sides in the course of time. But a careful examination reveals that the version originally presented nearly the same text as the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Vaticanus of the Greek Bible (consequently the text which we may regard as that of Hesychius).¹ But this original basis can only be clearly recognized at all events in the oldest manuscripts of the Sahidic Bible, and notably in the MS. of the Apocalypse already mentioned. However, this defect is compensated for by the fact that, complicated as is the position of the Sahidic version from the point of view of textual criticism, its position from the point of view of the history of the Canon is correspondingly simple and ancient. The Sahidic version follows, that is to say, very closely the Canon which Athanasius put forward in 367 A.D. in his Thirty-ninth Paschal Letter. This is in no way to be regarded as a matter of course; we shall see in a moment that another Coptic Biblical version which likewise originated in the fourth century presents serious divergences from Athanasius. It may be that the agreement of the Sahidic Bible with Athanasius points to the fact that the translation originated in the circle of Pachomius; for Pachomius and Athanasius became and continued great friends. In any case from its importance in the history of the Canon the Sahidic version regains what is lacking to its value from the point of view of textual criticism.

¹ There is no lack of significant divergences; e.g. the Sahidic Bible, like that of the Fayyoun and the Bohairic, contains the received text of the conclusion of St. Mark—i.e. the conclusion which may be traced back probably to the presbyter Aristion.

III.

The second Coptic Biblical version which came into being in the course of the fourth century is the Akhmîmic or Lower Sahidic, as to which we are unfortunately only very imperfectly informed. According to the latest manuscript discoveries it seems probable that this translation, like the Sahidic, extended to *all* the books of the Old and New Testaments which were reckoned as Scripture at that time in the district of Akhmîm; but we possess only very scanty fragments. The Akhmîmic dialect of Coptic very speedily disappeared, and was supplanted by the Sahidic. In Shenoute's monastery, which lay in the midst of the sphere of the Akhmîmic dialect, Sahidic seems to have been spoken from the beginning, and from this time forward the Sahidic dialect extended itself throughout the whole district. The result soon was that as no one had any further interest in spreading the Akhmîmic version more widely, it fell into oblivion; and hence only broken fragments now remain extant for us. As might be expected, these fragments do not make it possible for us to determine definitely the textual value of this version, and the more interesting, therefore, is the information which they give us for the history of the Canon. With regard to this we must notice in the first place that the Akhmîmic version certainly included the Epistle of James and the Epistle of Jude; and it is also probable that all the books stood in it which belonged to the Canon of Athanasius.

But this is not the most important point; for, secondly, it is a fact calling for special attention that the Akhmîmic Bible was *more* comprehensive in its contents than the Bible of Athanasius. The University Library at Strassburg acquired a short time ago an old Akhmîmic manuscript which contains the following writings: (i.) The so-called *First Epistle of Clement* (cc. i.-xxvi.); (ii.) the Epistle of James (complete); (iii.) fragments of the Gospel of St. John (cc. x.-xii., only copied to fill up the manuscript).¹

¹ For information with regard to this MS. the writer is indebted

From this fact it follows almost beyond question that the *First Epistle of Clement* formed a part of the Akhmîmic New Testament.¹ But besides the Books which are accepted as Scripture at the present day and the *First Epistle of Clement*, the Akhmîmic literature—for aught we know—only possessed the following works (we disregard ‘documents’ in the proper sense of the term—Letters, Contracts, &c.):—(i.) the *Apocalypse* (or probably more accurately an *Apocalypse*) of *Elijah*; (ii.) the *Apocalypse of Sophonias*; (iii.) an unknown *Apocalypse*; and (iv.) the *Acts of Paul*. All these Books stand in a known relationship to the Bible. Does not the question then directly suggest itself whether in Akhmîmic all these Books were not constituent parts of the Bible? Akhmîmic, indeed, like all Coptic dialects, possessed originally only a missionary literature; and, since it very soon disappeared, it never progressed beyond this point. A missionary literature, however, as is the case at the present day, is first and foremost composed of a translation of the Bible; and it would then be easily understandable if the Akhmîmic literature were a purely Biblical one. As regards the *Acts of Paul* especially, it may be taken as indication that we possess a further testimony in favour of the conclusion that this Book was treated by Egyptian Christians at that time as Holy Scripture. In the year 300 A.D. there came into existence in Egypt a List of the Canon which is known under the name of the ‘Catalogus Claromontanus’: in this the *Acts of Paul* form a part of the New Testament. Furthermore, the *Acts of Paul* in their Akhmîmic form bear the colophon Πράξεις Παύλου κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον [‘Acts of Paul according to the Apostle’]. The addition ‘according to the Apostle’ is not as yet certainly explained. Does it by chance furnish

to Mr. F. Röscher of Berlin, who will shortly publish an edition of it.

¹ A second Akhmîmic MS. of I. Clement (sæc. IV.) is in the possession of the Royal Library at Berlin, and will shortly be published by Prof. Carl Schmidt. The Codex Alexandrinus of the Greek Bible contains both the *Epistles of Clement*. Did it spring from the district of Akhmîm?

the ground on which the *Acts of Paul* were included in the Canon ?

IV.

We are as badly informed as in the case of the Akhmîmic Biblical version with regard the third Coptic translation of the Bible—the Fayyômic or middle-Egyptian. Its home is the Fayyôm—the district about Lake Moeris, and the Nile Valley eastward from thence, in the neighbourhood of the ancient Memphis. These were districts in which the native Egyptian element was much weaker than in Upper Egypt. So many Greeks settled there that the instinct of self-preservation demanded of all the Copts of the Fayyôm that they should learn Greek. The result was that the Copts here could without difficulty join the Greek-Christian communities; and the necessity for translating the Bible into Fayyômic ceased to exist. It originated first after the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.)—at the time when the Monophysite Church, to which the native Egyptians principally belonged, separated itself from the Dyophysite State Church, to which for the most part the Greeks belonged. Next the mixed Greek-Coptic communities of the Fayyôm became split up into native Greek and native Coptic communities; and then, too, the Fayyômic translation of the Bible may well have been begun. We have, unfortunately, even fewer remains of this than we have of the Akhmîmic version. The Fayyômic would soon be supplanted by the Bohairic, penetrating thither from the north, and by the Sahidic, coming to it from the south. It is probable that at no time was the *whole* Bible translated into Fayyômic; in any case there are only trifling fragments remaining. However, these fragments are for us of the greatest interest, even though the interest is for the most part negative; for they present us with problems which we cannot solve. We will only mention two of these problems. The first is a literary one; the various Fayyômic texts differ very strongly from one another, so strongly that they have been distinguished into separate sub-dialects—a genuine Fayyômic and a Memphitic. We can almost assert that every

new Fayyomic text which becomes known to us brings us a new dialect. Was the Bible translated afresh into every single one of the Fayyomic sub-dialects? Or did the copyists proceed so arbitrarily in matters of orthography, of grammar, and of lexicography that every new MS. would be, so to speak, a new translation? We are unable to give an answer to these questions; our information is too slight.

The second enigma which the Fayyomic version propounds to us is of a textual character. The Fayyomic version, like the Sahidic, presents in general the same text as we read in the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Vaticanus of the Greek Bible—that is to say, the presumed text of Hesychius. But that text is in no case preserved pure in this version. On the one hand, there are found in it undoubtedly remains of older recensions of the text—*e.g.*, the Fayyomic version bears witness to a form of the third clause of the Lord's Prayer, which elsewhere is probably only found in Tertullian, viz. 'Thy will be done *in heaven and on earth*.' On the other hand, there are in this version, and even in its older MSS., imported elements which hardly had a place in the original text of Hesychius—*e.g.*, the ending of St. Mark ascribed to the presbyter Aristion.¹ It would be of the very greatest importance to be able at some future time to study more considerable fragments of the Fayyomic Bible wherewith we might be able to solve these enigmas. It must be admitted that the hope of finding such fragments is very small. The knowledge of Greek was always too widely spread in the Fayyom for the Fayyomic version to have been able to win for itself so wide a popularity as the Sahidic enjoyed further south. It is typical of this that there have been but very few codices which presented *only* the Fayyomic translation: in most cases the original Greek text has been placed beside the translation. This suggests the probability that services would never or very seldom be held exclusively in the Fayyomic language.

¹ See above, p. 304.

V.

Such, then, is the position of the Coptic translations of the Bible, considered apart from the Bohairic-Coptic version. What place does the *Bohairic* version occupy in relation to the other three?

The first question which arises is the chronological one. It used to be thought that the Bohairic translation of the Bible is one of the oldest textual witnesses which exist, going back to the third and very probably to the second century. This view will find supporters at the present day only in a few circles, and it does not seem to the present writer to be tenable. First of all it must be noticed that the Bohairic Biblical version, like the Sahidic and the Fayyomic, presupposes the Greek text presented by the Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus—that is to say, the text which would be employed among the Greek Christians of Egypt in the fourth century and probably goes back to Hesychius. The fourth century is thus the *terminus a quo* for the time of origin of the Bohairic version of the Bible. Naturally it *may* have arisen much later; since the translator, even in the sixth century, may quite well have made use of a fourth-century manuscript as the basis of his work. When the Bohairic version actually arose can be further determined, not on textual grounds, but only by considerations of literary criticism.

In this connection attention may be called at the outset to one fact. The Bohairic dialect is the Coptic dialect which was originally spoken in the neighbourhood of Alexandria (Rakoti). Then later, when the Coptic patriarch transferred his see from Alexandria to Cairo, the Bohairic dialect made progress towards the south and supplanted first of all the Fayyomic, and then the Sahidic. In the neighbourhood of Alexandria the Greek language was naturally as widely—probably, indeed, even more widely—spread as in the Fayyom. A Bohairic literature, therefore, cannot have arisen earlier than a Fayyomic one—in other words, not before the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.), and the possibility even then remains

open that the Bohairic literature first came into being long after this Council. One cannot but consider how small and insignificant the Fayyomic literature is, how large and imposing the Bohairic. One remembers, further, that according to all laws of history a national Coptic literature must have arisen still later in the Delta—entirely Græcized as it was, and as widely as possible removed from the centre of national Egyptian life—than in the Fayyom. A further possibility has also to be considered: the Bohairic translation of the Bible might have come into existence after the Hellenism of Lower Egypt had been convulsed not only through the Monophysite schism of the Church, but still further by an event of wider consequences—viz. through the Arab conquest (641 A.D.).¹ As a result of foreign domination the upper strata of the population—represented in Egypt by the Greeks—always became more deserving of pity than the lower. The upper strata became either annihilated or absorbed; in either case, they lost their national individuality, while the nationality of the lower strata can develop itself more strongly. In fact, Coptic-Arabic books are as numerous in Bohairic as Coptic-Greek in Fayyomic.

A second observation supports this result. The oldest Bohairic Biblical manuscripts, and the oldest Bohairic manuscripts in general, date from the ninth century.² We possess Sahidic and Akhmîmic manuscripts, on the other hand, from soon after the fourth century, and consequently even from the century in which a Sahidic and an Akhmîmic literature first arose. And at the same time, to sum up, far more Bohairic manuscripts have survived than Sahidic and Akhmîmic. This state of affairs is plainly absurd if the origin of the Bohairic literature had occurred no less than five centuries earlier than the transcription of the oldest extant manuscript. Now it may be admitted at once that the oldest Bohairic manuscript of the Bible is not the original manuscript of the translator.

¹ Moreover, the Persian conquest, which occurred shortly before, would have weakened Egyptian Hellenism.

² See Horner, vol. i. p. xxxvii.

On the contrary, it can be shewn that the Bohairic version of the Bible had, at the time when the MS. with which we are concerned was written, already experienced a complicated textual history, to which we shall shortly return. But for this textual history we need not, and ought not, to reckon in our calculation a longer time than one hundred or two hundred years. Thus palæographical considerations also bring us to the conclusion that the Bohairic version of the Bible came into existence about the year 700 A.D.

This result will finally be more securely established, we believe, by a wider consideration—by a consideration, in fact, of a philological character. Coptic in all its dialects is rich in Greek loan-words. The Egyptian has always found a special pleasure in extraneous imports even in times of the most vigorous national prosperity. At the time of the New Kingdom, when the Pharaohs waged victorious wars in Syria, everything Syriac passed as 'up to date,' including the Syriac language. Alien Semitic words—*e.g.* 'merkabhah' ('chariot')—found their way into Egyptian at that time in very large numbers. In like manner the Egyptians from the days of the Ptolemies onward were enthusiastic for everything Greek. Further, besides Greek art, it was in this case the Greek language which especially attracted them. And an honest judge is compelled to say that the Egyptian language *needed* the loan-words. In the time of the Ptolemies that language had already lived through three thousand years of advanced culture. And the language, if we may venture to say so, had become degenerated thereby, since a language only maintains itself in its old original purity and freshness when it lives in conditions of extreme isolation, like Arabic, for example, among the Bedouins of the Desert. And it is no wonder that Egyptian declined in course of time. It lost word and clause forms, and with these the possibility of rendering finer *nuances* of meaning. Further, it lost also many a valuable fragment out of its word-store, and therewith the possibility of indicating significantly one subject or another.† It was

indispensable, then, that Greek loan-words, and especially Greek conjunctions and particles, should be adopted into Egyptian, if the language was not to lose the possibility of giving expression to more complex ideas. Hence we speedily find in the Demotic speech, and still more in Coptic, a large number of alien Greek words. The Egyptians in these later times could scarcely express conjunctions like 'but' and 'for,' ideas like 'spirit,' 'love,' 'repentance,' otherwise than by means of the Greek words *δέ, γάρ, πνεῦμα, ἀγάπη, μετάνοια*. Hence we find in all Coptic translations of the Bible a copious store of alien words.

But a significant difference prevails in this respect. Generally speaking (we may pass over some few exceptions which have their special *raison d'être*), we find more alien words in the older Coptic than in the later. This can readily be understood, since it was absolutely necessary to admit *some* alien words if Egyptian was not to degenerate from a language of culture to one of children. But, as generally happens, too much use was made of this from the first, and more alien words were admitted than were absolutely necessary. There existed, for example, a good Coptic word, 'nahte,' to express the idea 'faith'; but it was eagerly rendered from the outset by the Greek word *πίστις*. The preference for what was foreign and Greek, and the indolence of the interpreters—there were, of course, no Græco-Coptic dictionaries in existence—were favourable to this over-production in regard to alien words. Later a reaction set in, when, after the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D., and even more after the Persian-Arabic conquest, everything Greek in Egypt fell into discredit. As a result, all alien Greek words which appeared unnecessary were expelled again. In these efforts at purification they went occasionally further than was expedient; individual popular texts shew us that they eschewed even *δέ* and *γάρ*, and preferred to place the different clauses side by side without connecting links rather than join them in an unmistakable manner by the Greek 'but' or 'for.' The Bohairic version of the Bible is freer from alien words than any other Coptic translation; and this fact is a proof,

therefore, that we have rightly determined the time of its origin.

The Bohairic translation of the Bible, then, is a very late version; but it is clear that one is not on that account justified in concluding that it is of no value for the student who is concerned with the textual criticism of the New Testament. Its value for textual criticism depends on entirely different considerations from the antiquity of the extant version, and we can shew that in this case the value for textual criticism is in fact very great.

The Sahidic Biblical version is centuries older than the Bohairic, and yet is only of scanty service for New Testament textual criticism. The inhabitants of Upper Egypt shewed themselves true Orientals in their inability to hand down their Biblical version uncontaminated. They altered the text without consideration on the strength of later Greek recensions; they adapted without consideration similar passages in the Synoptic Gospels into complete conformity with one another; with like thoughtlessness they even inserted mythological details into the New Testament text. For example, in the parable of the rich man and the poor Lazarus they called the rich man Nineue (*Nineue*). This name stands in all extant Sahidic Biblical manuscripts, although Shenoute was unacquainted with it. It is therefore a gloss, relatively old indeed, but intrinsically Sahidic in character. The result is that even from the oldest Sahidic Biblical manuscripts we can scarcely perceive clearly the original recension, the conjectural text of Hesychius.

The case is quite different with the Bohairic Bible. The inhabitants of Lower Egypt were not united into one solid body like those of Upper Egypt; hence they fell the more readily under Greek influences. And there can be no doubt that they had learnt from the Greeks of Alexandria one thing in particular, which is of special importance for us in this connection—namely, scientific textual criticism, which found at that time its home in Alexandria. Now undoubtedly even the men who multiplied copies of the Bohairic Bible ‘improved’—*i.e.*, in

actual fact 'impaired'—the original text on the strength of later Greek recensions, since the late Byzantine *κοινή*¹ makes its appearance in place of the text of Hesychius. But a twofold distinction exists between the Sahidic and the Bohairic copyists. In the first place, the scribes of Lower Egypt, when they made changes, always altered with scientific knowledge, and never hastily. The valuable Arabic comments which are found in the margin shew us that they had systematically pursued textual studies, and desired to store up their information in their MSS.; and, in the second place, very many inhabitants of Lower Egypt regarded it as inadmissible to alter the Bohairic text handed down to them. We have, indeed, from a later time manuscripts which present the old Hesychian text with comparative freedom from contamination. Only Arabic glosses in the margin inform us in this case that the scribe has inspected Greek manuscripts which give another (later) text.

The glosses of the Bohairic Biblical manuscripts deserve a special mention. They are instructive, in the first place, for the history of textual criticism, since they shew us that textual criticism is not an invention of the eighteenth century or even only of modern times. Further, they are instructive also for textual criticism itself, since we see here what types of text an attentive investigator in the Oriental 'Middle Ages' observed. We will give some examples of such glosses:—

1. In Matt. i. 6 the Bohairic version gives, like the Greek MSS. \aleph and B, 'And David begat Solomon.' On this we find in one Bohairic MS. the Arabic gloss, 'the King, in Greek and not in the Coptic.' The Byzantine *κοινή* actually gives: 'And King David begat Solomon.' The Coptic scribe has thus in this case, with full knowledge, preserved the older text.

2. In Matt. i. 25 the Bohairic translation gives, again in company with the Greek MSS. \aleph and B: 'Until she bare the son.' To this there occurs in two Bohairic manuscripts the note, 'Greek, "her first-born son."'

¹ See above, p. 296.

3. It is a very interesting fact for us at the present day that the scribes of the Bohairic manuscripts have not only compared late Greek MSS. which preserve an inferior text, but occasionally (even if very rarely and only at an earlier time) old Greek MSS., the text of which was superior to the Bohairic. The Bohairic Bible, for example, contains the usual conclusion of the Gospel of St. Mark—that ascribed to the presbyter Aristion. But one MS., undoubtedly an old one, affixes to it in the margin the Arabic gloss: 'This is the chapter expelled in the Greek.'

It is an important fact for the textual criticism of the New Testament that it is not only *Greek* manuscripts which have been drawn upon in the Arabic marginal glosses of the Bohairic translation. In the first place, the Arabic Biblical text has been brought into comparison with considerable zeal, thus affording very instructive material for an estimate of the Arabic version of the Bible which was current in Egypt at that time. The subject of the Arabic versions is a very large and little cultivated one; but here we obtain a fixed point—namely, that the Arabic version which was in use in Egypt in the Middle Ages was not derived from the Bohairic, since it presents a much later text than that of the most inferior Bohairic manuscripts. It rests rather on late Greek manuscripts which contain the text of the Byzantine *κοινή*. In the Bohairic version the passage with regard to the angel at the Pool of Bethesda (John v. 3-4) was originally missing. The inferior manuscripts have, nevertheless, introduced it on the strength of later Greek manuscripts—one, indeed, with the gloss 'added in the Arabic.' The position with regard to the 'Pericope Adulteræ' (John vii. 53-viii. 11) is exactly similar. It is, moreover, a very characteristic fact that an Arabic version of the Bible came into existence in Egypt at a time when Bohairic Biblical manuscripts were still largely multiplied. It is certain that the Arabic version did not serve for missionary purposes, since the Coptic Christians did not engage in missionary work among the Muhammadans, and, indeed, could not have done so without imperilling their political position. The Arabic

translations then served for the Coptic Christians themselves; from which we may infer how speedily the knowledge of Coptic became lost at that time.

But the scribes of Lower Egypt used for comparison not only Greek and Arabic manuscripts, but, as occasion served, Syriac and Armenian ones as well. On John v. 3-4 a Bohairic manuscript notes: 'This is an addition in the Greek *and the Armenian* and the Arabic.' On the narrative of the 'Woman taken in Adultery,' one codex notes: 'This section is not contained by the Coptic, nor some of the Greek copies,' *nor the Syriac.*' We can understand how the people of Lower Egypt became acquainted with Syriac Biblical manuscripts, since in the Nitrian Desert, westward of the Nile delta, there existed a Syriac monastery, the Monastery of Mary, in which valuable Syriac manuscripts have been discovered even in our own day. Not far from the Monastery of Mary lay the Coptic monastery of Macarius, the central home of the Bohairic literature. Relations must certainly have sprung up between the two monasteries, and hence we can easily understand how it came about that on occasion in critical passages the two Biblical texts were compared one with the other. But it is absolutely amazing that the Copts should have been acquainted also with the Armenian Bible. Was this acquaintance also by chance derived through the medium of the Syriac monastery to which we have referred? The relations between Syrians and Armenians were, indeed, at that time very close, so that it is easily possible that an Armenian might at some time or other have strayed into the Syriac monastery in Egypt.

We must now turn to the question what critical value the Bohairic translation of the New Testament possesses in itself, apart from the glosses. And here at the outset our attention is demanded by a feature which we have

¹ We see, moreover, from this note that it was not only one Greek manuscript which had been used for comparison, but many. The Greek manuscripts which do not contain John vii. 53-viii. 11 were undoubtedly very old and far from numerous. It is an honourable distinction that the Copts discussed and paid attention to them.

already noticed more than once. The manuscripts exhibit plainly two distinct types of text, which we will call α and β for the sake of brevity— α presenting undoubtedly the older, and β the later type. Now it is quite true that no manuscript exists which shews us in its purity the one type, since all extant MSS. are too late for this. But the majority incline strongly to one of the two types, and it is only a comparatively few manuscripts that present what is in principle a mixed type of text. We may indicate briefly the most important differences of the two types, using for the purpose of our remarks the *sigla* by which Mr. Horner denotes the Bohairic Biblical manuscripts.

1. The α type is more closely allied, word for word, to the original form of the Greek text than the β type, and presents, therefore, an inferior style of Coptic; the β type polishes at the expense of literalness. This is shewn especially in the fact that α makes use of the conjunction 'and' much more often than β . The Copt loves asyndeton—sentences placed side by side without connecting links; whereas in the Greek New Testament, on the other hand, the word 'and' is very frequent: α always uses it in translating; β often leaves it out. St. Matthew ii. 2 furnishes an example. The Greek has *καὶ ἤλθομεν*; in the Coptic the α type ($\Delta_{1-2}\Delta E_2 F_2 GK$) reads 'and we came,' the β type simply 'we came.'

2. The α type stands nearer to the Sahidic dialect and to the Sahidic Biblical text than the β type. For the philological relationship of α with the Sahidic we may cite as an example St. Matthew v. 46. Here α ($\Delta_{1-2} E_{1-2}$) gives 'nethmei,' β 'nê ethmei.' The first form stands much nearer to the Sahidic 'netme' than the second. So far as the textual relationship of the Sahidic and the better Bohairic Biblical manuscripts is concerned, this is explained in part by the fact that the Sahidic and the Bohairic translations go back substantially to the same Greek recension, the conjectural text of Hesychius. With these resemblances, which explain themselves by making use of the same source, we are not here concerned. But the Bohairic translation exhibits in its better manuscripts

in more than one place readings which are undoubtedly peculiar readings of the Sahidic translation. The Bohairic MS. α , for example, undoubtedly a textual witness which is almost three hundred years older than the next oldest Bohairic Biblical manuscript, gives in Matt. v. 37 the text: 'But let your Yea be "Yea, yea," and your Nay be "Nay."' This mixed text of Matt. v. 37 and James v. 12 is found elsewhere, perhaps, only in the Sahidic version; in fact, all other Bohairic manuscripts present the usual reading, 'But let your words be yea yea, nay nay.'

3. The β type shews in many places intrinsically Coptic corruptions of the text which are not found in the α type. Thus in Matt. ii. 23 the MSS. ABCE₂F₂GHI₃S read, 'which *he said* by his prophets'; on the other hand, D₁₋₂ Δ ₁K have, 'which *was said* through the prophets.' The former reading is undoubtedly derived not from another Greek recension but only from a corruption of the Coptic text. It is a matter of the confusion of two letters which very often became exchanged. Intrinsically Coptic corruptions of the text may be illustrated further by giving two other special examples: Matt. iii. 15, where 'since' is omitted in A^{*}E₁, and Matt. iv. 6, where AG^{*} read 'ntotou' instead of 'etotou,' &c.

4. Finally, the α type represents in very many places an older Greek text than the β type. We mention only two instructive passages. In Matt. ii. 6 'since' is wanting in the manuscripts B Θ ^{*}, as in the first hand of the Greek Codex Sinaiticus. The 'Pericope Adulteræ' (John vii. 53-viii. 11) is wanting (as in the older Greek MSS.) in the good Bohairic codices A^{*}C₁₋₂FD₁₋₂₋₃₋₄ Δ ₁F₂EG₂H₁₋₃ Θ KLMN PQT β '.

Naturally in different New Testament books the comparatively best text has been preserved in quite different manuscripts. It often happened that a scribe who had constructed a complete Gospel manuscript took each single Gospel from a different recension, and that these recensions were of very different value from the point of view of textual criticism. We have selected the majority of the examples given from the Gospel of St. Matthew in order

to shew at once that in the same New Testament book the same manuscripts have preserved almost invariably the purest text, and, further, that the manuscripts allow themselves to be arranged in groups. In St. Matthew the codices DÆ, as appears from the examples, specially distinguish themselves.

One question must not be overlooked in connexion with the classification of the Bohairic Biblical manuscripts. It is possible that the text of the group of manuscripts which we have called *a* is not the original text of the Bohairic translation, but first arose as supplementary, in that the original Bohairic text was altered on the strength of better Greek manuscripts. Naturally this possibility is from first to last very unlikely, for this reason especially—that the manuscripts of class *a* almost always made their appearance in larger number; and, indeed, they are in particular points so different one from another that they could in no case be traced back to *one* archetype. But since they do not go back to *one* archetype, we may exclude the hypothesis that their good readings are only the work of a corrector; they must be original constituent parts of the Bohairic translation of the Bible. Only a single manuscript (B) gives the impression that it has been worked through by a corrector who inspected Greek manuscripts of greater antiquity: this manuscript exhibits very many peculiar readings which no other Bohairic manuscript contains.

We ask, further, which Greek text the original form of the Bohairic version represents. We will cite some typical passages by the help of which this question may be determined with sufficient precision.

1. In Matt. i. 6 'David' appears in both cases without the addition 'the King,' as in the Greek MSS. αB.

2. In Matt. ii. 3 we find the order of the words 'the King Herod' the same as in αB.

3. In Matt. v. 47 the Bohairic gives not *τελῶναι*, but *ἔθνικοί*, with αBΔZ.

4. The 'Pericope Adulteræ,' to which we have frequently referred, is wanting in the Bohairic.

¶ This enumeration of passages might be considerably lengthened. Hundreds of passages shew that the Bohairic translation of the New Testament represents a Greek text which is very old. It belongs to the fourth century, and agrees most closely with the text of the two Greek MSS. α B, and, further, with the conjectural text of Hesychius, which would have been universally used in Egypt in the fourth century. Of course, divergences are not wanting, the most important, indeed, being the fact that the 'Aristion-ending' of St. Mark's Gospel finds a place in the Bohairic Bible from the first, whilst it is lacking in α B. But these divergences, rare as they are and for the most part right, cannot upset the verdict that the Greek original of the Bohairic version of the Bible is very closely related to the text of Hesychius.

We have seen already that the Sahidic version also goes back to a text which stands very close to that of Hesychius. The question suggests itself whether the Sahidic text is related to the original recension on which the Bohairic translation is based—or was it by chance absolutely its only original recension? The question is very important, but, owing to the unfavourable condition of the materials of our sources, admits, unfortunately, only of the answer *Non liquet*. The Sahidic translation of the Bible speedily became corrupted. Of its oldest form we know frankly little; and, further, the original form of the Bohairic version is, at any rate, not in every case to be ascertained with certainty. It is only certain that the Bohairic translation of the Bible contained peculiar readings which are also peculiar readings of the Sahidic Bible. The possibility arises, further, in each case that the Sahidic translation has belonged to the sources of the Bohairic.

The Bohairic version of the New Testament possesses, further, not only a value for textual criticism, but also for the history of the Canon. In this connection it comes into consideration especially in two directions:

(a) The Bohairic Biblical version corresponds closely with the Canon which Athanasius drew up in his thirty-ninth Festal Letter in 367 A.D. In particular, it contains

the seven Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse. At most a divergence could be found in the fact that the *Pastor* of Hermas and the *Didache* were not translated into Bohairic—at any rate, we do not know anything of them. But Athanasius himself did not ascribe full canonical authority to the *Pastor* and the *Didache*; in fact, soon after the time of Athanasius both books were forgotten by the official representatives of the Egyptian Church. Only among the common people did they still continue to live. The Sahidic literature, which is centuries older than the Bohairic, contained a translation of the *Pastor* and probably also of the *Didache*.

(b) In the Bohairic version the Catholic Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles are always closely connected together. This connection, as Philaster of Brescia, the opponent of heretics, in the fourth century expressly informs us, was in old days generally customary. At the same time it is of great value to possess a new proof of the fact, since this connection is an indication that the Catholic Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles were at one time included in the Canon *together*. The Catholic Epistles ought to have shewn the Gnostics, and especially Marcion, that the original Apostles were throughout in agreement with Paul; and the Acts of the Apostles ought to serve the same end; for this reason they bear in the Muratorian Canon a title which, properly speaking, certainly does not belong to them, —‘*Acta omnium Apostolorum*.’

Thus the Bohairic translation of the New Testament is of the greatest value, despite the fact that it does not belong to the oldest class of translations. We owe Mr. Horner the most cordial thanks for having made it accessible to us in so beautiful an edition, one which reflects credit both on him and on the great University Press from which it issues. We most earnestly hope that it may be permitted to Mr. Horner to bring to a fortunate and successful conclusion also the new work which he has now taken in hand—the publication of the Sahidic New Testament, which, alike for the student of history, of philology, and above all of the Bible, gives, if possible, even more

valuable information than the Bohairic, since it is centuries older.

There is, indeed, one wish which we cannot repress when we see the eagerness with which the publication of the Coptic translations of the New Testament will be called for at the present day. It is an old and well-recognized truth that the Alexandrian Greek translation of the Old Testament—the so-called Septuagint—is one of the most valuable textual witnesses for the Old Testament; it is in many places more valuable than the Hebrew text of the Massorettes. It is similarly true, but, unfortunately, not generally known, that the Coptic translations of the Old Testament were derived from the Septuagint, and furnish probably the most important medium for the restoration of the oldest Septuagint text. When will the time of the Coptic *Old* Testament come? The majority of the manuscripts are decaying, unpublished, in the libraries of Europe or Egypt. The little which has been printed is well printed only so far as one small part is concerned, and for an even smaller part well translated. And yet every edition of the Septuagint which fails to attack the Coptic translations must be regarded as being from the outset obsolete and a failure. It is one of the most earnest wishes of the critic of the Biblical text that for the Coptic *Old* Testament also a George Horner may speedily arise.

ART. IV.—MYSTICISM AND DISCIPLINE.

1. *Unity in Diversity.* By C. BIGG, D.D. (London: Longmans, 1899.) 2s. 6d.
2. *An Introduction to Christian Mysticism.* By ELEANOR C. GREGORY. (London: Allenson, 1901.) 1s.

DR. BIGG'S lectures, delivered to undergraduates in the Cathedral Church of Christ at Oxford in Lent, 1899, are an attempt to lead us, by consideration of the nature and laws of the higher kinds of unity, to a recognition of the way in which we may seek wisely for the blessing of Unity for all

who profess and call themselves Christians, whilst preserving that richness of life which is the blessing of Diversity, and which, equally with unity,¹ is the law of God's creation. Dr. Bigg is primarily, though by no means exclusively, concerned to find a basis for such union between the English Church and English Dissent; and he traces existing differences up to a fundamental difference between St. Peter and St. Paul. He finds in St. Peter the pastor, the disciplinarian, the ruler, the rock on whom the Catholic Church, with her ordered constitution, her organization, her hierarchy, her times and seasons, and her discipline, is founded. He finds in St. Paul the prophet and the mystic, who sees in the man of rules and ordinances simply the weak brother. St. Paul has passed from the bondage of external law, and relies wholly upon the strength and guidance of the indwelling Spirit, Who, because He is the Spirit of God, may be trusted—nay, must be trusted—in contempt of all lesser helps, to lead us to freedom and the glory of God. Yet St. Peter and St. Paul dwelt together in unity, in spite of difficulties in practice: they did so in the power of the Holy Ghost; and if they did so, why not we?

Thus the greatest of all questions for us is a mutual readjustment of Discipline and Mysticism, by which Catholics may learn to bear with and treasure the spirit of spontaneity and freedom, recognizing that where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty; and by which the spiritual individualist, the Protestant, may learn that corporate religion involves organization and laws, and moreover (and this especially) that for some individuals, perhaps even for the majority, obedience to external law, whether of faith or morals, is the stage of spiritual growth in which they are, at least temporarily, called to follow Jesus.

Dr. Bigg then speaks of Mysticism and Mystics, whom he broadly contrasts throughout with Disciplinarians, defining them shortly as 'those who believe in mysteries,' and enumerating the mysteries as God, the Soul, Revelation, Unity and Eternity. Wesley is his typical mystic—Wesley in his later stages. Jacob Behmen and Madame Guyon and St. John of the Cross he dismisses as extravagants, and

tells those who wish to find Mysticism at its best to go to St. Augustine's 'Confessions,' the 'Theologia Germanica,' Thomas à Kempis and Tauler, particularly to the latter, whom he regards with glowing approbation.

The next chapter deals with the comprehensiveness of our Lord's Personality, and with the perfect balance in which He holds the diverse elements of human nature. But as soon as we pass from the fulness of Christ to the limited individualities of even His greatest followers, we begin to recognize what it is to be a part and not the whole, and to get hints of the resultant problems. Christ's followers group themselves broadly into two streams or tendencies of religious life, flowing from the same source, but not always side by side. Dr. Bigg calls them the Mystic and the Disciplinary streams, purposely avoiding any historical party labels, which would bring the threadbare ugliness of workaday controversy into view.

'Man has soul and body, and therefore thoughts and duties. Which are the more important, the thoughts or duties, faith or works? What is the precise relationship between them? You may answer such questions differently, and may quote Christ's authority for your answer. According to your view, you are more or less of a mystic, more or less of a disciplinarian.'

There must always be Diversity; it is the warp of the web of creation. Equally must there always be the woof of Unity, or the web of creation will not achieve true being. And Christ's teaching recognizes both needs. The City of God, the Kingdom of Heaven, the Family of the Heavenly Father, in which no child is quite like another, that is one side of His teaching. But 'He calleth His own sheep by name,' and

'His appeal is always exquisitely personal. "He saith unto her, 'Mary'"; "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?" Each soul has direct access to the Saviour, yet none can thrive outside the Saviour's family. In a great orchestra there are many instruments, and the attention of each performer is riveted on his own part alone. If he were to listen to the others, he would forget his part. It is only when he is himself at rest, waiting

for his turn, that he can hear the concord. Yet he does not therefore wish to go aside and play by himself, or to take his place among the audience, where he could enjoy and criticise at his ease. He loves the music, and holds fast to a proportion and a fitness, according to a law which he did not make, but has come to love and understand.'

Then, in three chapters, Dr. Bigg deals with St. Paul the Mystic, St. Peter the Disciplinarian, and the 'Unknown Philosopher,' as he calls the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who, he guesses, may have been St. Luke.

Of St. Paul, he says, four things may be asserted :

'First, that whenever the Church has protested against formalism or mechanism, the appeal has always been made chiefly to him.

Secondly, that of all the New Testament writers he is the most mystical.

Thirdly, that none preaches unity so emphatically as he.

Fourthly, that none has so clearly shown how unity not only recognises but actually springs out of diversity.'

In dealing with St. Paul's attitude towards law, he urges that 'his language may easily be interpreted to mean that even the moral law does not remain in force as law.'

Many people try to reconcile St. Paul's teaching with that of St. Peter and St. James. Dr. Bigg does not say that they violently disagree, but he thinks that to harmonize unduly is to miss an important point, which is that it was in spite of real differences of judgement that they lived and worked in unity. And he reminds us that it is just the Apostle who values Christian liberty most highly who is the great expounder of Unity. His is the great figure of the Body and the members. For there are many kinds of unity, from 'the unity of a heap of sand' to 'the unity of a great cathedral organ,' in which, as Dr. Bigg says, 'the diversities defy computation.' Yet the diversities are essential to the unity of the organ, and to the production of the hymn of praise. It is the difference of the parts which constitutes their bonds of union. So, our differences

should unite us, when each of us gives what he is able to give, and receives the help he needs. The ideal is not independence, but mutual dependence—dependence and service. And for our failures and weaknesses there is the sovereign remedy of the Cross, in which the glory of God and man is proclaimed by the vicarious sacrifice of Him, Who for the hope that was set before Him, the hope of Unity, of the Perfected Kingdom, the hope of bringing the lost sheep home to the One Fold, endured the Cross, despising the shame.

And so, though in the Pauline ideals of Faith, of the direct leading of God, of personal inspiration, these great mystical ideas, we have, Dr. Bigg says, the most violent explosives, yet in St. Paul himself, if not always in his followers, we have the charity, the spirit of infinite generosity and patience and regard for the needs of the whole Body, which must be exercised, if the explosives are not to burst every form of society to atoms.

But while to St. Paul the Gospel came as a spiritual deliverance from legalism, as a gift of freedom, to Simon the son of Jonas, the impulsive, the enthusiastic, who was apt to embrace ideals and make grand promises in moments of enthusiasm, which he found it hard to carry out in the duller intervals of daily life, the same Gospel came as a warning not to trust his impulses for support, nor to imagine that the tide of life would always be in flow when it was wanted, but to discipline enthusiasm and to test it by hard work.

‘Lovest thou me? Feed my sheep.’ St. Peter’s Epistle is full of the hope of glory; but the glory is a hidden glory. He does not write of prophecy nor of spiritual gifts, which St. Paul urges the Corinthians to covet earnestly; but he says much of obedience—of obedience to God, and to the Truth, and to the Word of God; of obedient children and obedient wives; of obedience to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake. To the elders he speaks as fellow-elder, and bids them feed the flock of God as he had himself been bidden, and the younger are to be in subjection to the elder. We are to pass the time of our sojourning here in

fear, however gladly we accept the privilege of calling God our Father. We are to be sober and vigilant and beware of the devil, like people who know that there is a hungry lion in their neighbourhood.

St. Peter, then, is mainly the pastor, who leads the flock cautiously, as one who must give account for them. St. Paul is mainly the prophet. He rejoices to mount up on wings as an eagle; he will run and not be weary. St. Peter would have remembered that Isaiah added as his climax, 'They shall walk, and not faint.'

Dr. Bigg questions whether of any two types that are necessary one can be higher than the other. Perhaps it is not quite obvious why not. Whether the prophet be greater than the pastor is a narrower question; but we wonder whether either of the Apostles would have thought otherwise.

In the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews Dr. Bigg finds a combination of Mystic and Disciplinarian. Development is one of this writer's greatest ideas. The Old Testament represents an early stage of education. Faith is the power of progress towards a hope shadowed forth by symbols. Christian life begins with Discipline and the first principles of the oracles of God, and goes on to Perfection. Thus Discipline is but a stage in education, and culminates in Mysticism; though even the mystic must remember that 'God is a consuming fire.' This writer would hardly have disapproved of the attempt to clothe the holiness of worship with a garment of beauty; but he would have warned us that even Christian Symbolism is but the shadow of good things to come. And as we draw nearer to God Himself we draw nearer to the time when the shadows flee away. The mystic ever prays to be initiated into the inwardness of life, and can be content to find that what is seen is temporal.

The last chapter of the book should be read with the first, and is an appeal to the lesson of history. We are besought to realize that the knowledge won by the new school of historians lays upon us the obligation of a wider wisdom than our fathers were able to achieve. Dr. Bigg traces in the history of the Church the swing of the pendulum between Mysticism

and Discipline. The sub-apostolic Church is Petrine and disciplinary. Then comes the Alexandrian appeal from the bondage of the letter. Later, when the discipline that had tamed the northern conquerors had grown rigid and corrupt, came Francis of Assisi and the German Mystics. There is a rhythm in life, a tide in the affairs of men ; and truth abides not permanently in either extreme, nor in the middle, as many think, but oscillates between the two extremes. Freedom and law must meet together friendly. Dr. Bigg remarks that they have solved the problem of doing so in English municipal life. To be sure he does not actually suggest that we should aim at municipal organization for the Church ; but he pleads for a scientific theology, which shall clearly lay down the minimum requirements for real Unity in Diversity ; and he asks why we should think parties a necessity.

Above all, he would have us each and all draw personally nearer to Him Who is the centre and source of Unity. And while in the above pages we have described without criticism, and have not been careful to realize where the writer's own words end and ours begin, yet upon review we shall not surely hesitate to agree that this is the beginning and ending of the matter, however great our troubles by the way. For in proportion as we draw nearer to Christ and to His Mind (and the one involves the other), we shall become more conscious of His Will that we should be One, and of the sin of acquiescence in disunion. While corporate reunion will not be the beginning but the end, we shall strive more earnestly to know and love those who follow Christ, though not along with us. We shall regard the dissenter as the brother Christian, and shall aim at personal fellowship even while ecclesiastical fellowship is deferred. When we do this our controversies will tend to become consultations, and mutual conference will lead, not indeed to mutual conversion, but to mutual understanding, sympathy, patience and respect, and to a desire to draw gradually nearer to one another. It will lead not only to respect for the work and lives of those who follow, but follow not with us, but also to corporate humility and repentance. To work in a

great mission field, where half a dozen separated Christian bodies have worked twice as long as the Church, helps to make hackneyed phrases about 'God's uncovenanted mercies' seem impossible.

And yet, while we learn from Christ the need of love and unity, while we strive for fellowship with ecclesiastically separated individuals, while we substitute consultation for denunciation, and humble and penitent admiration for contempt, we must remember to be 'first pure, then peaceable,' and that to sacrifice the least essential of Catholic Order and Catholic Faith is to sacrifice precisely what we hold in trust for future unity, precisely that element in the true diversity of gifts, that distinguishing and characteristic duty of service, which is our contribution to the Unity of the future, without which that unity would not be the rich and valuable unity after all.

Even so, we must be careful to remember the obligations of study and of an open mind. For if our position with regard to Catholic Faith and Order be of value, it is valuable as Truth, and as Truth only. Can we yet afford to despise a reminder that there is always a danger of loving a position because it is our own, and of both fearing and shirking investigation? To combine loyalty to Catholic tradition with vigour and candour of research is the equally difficult and characteristic task of this generation. In regard to unity, it demands the fullest willingness to endure all the suffering that loyalty to Catholic Order entails upon those who really care for unity, with eagerness to welcome all that can be established, all that can be finally and surely established, even in respect of the nature of Catholic Order, by history, criticism, and sound learning.

Lastly, while we hold faithfully in trust for the future unity that Truth which is peculiarly our own, we have the complementary duty of learning from Christians, contemporary or historical, who have reacted from discipline to mysticism, the truth to which their movements have borne witness.

There can be no doubt that, as Dr. Bigg contends, mysticism has continually appeared as a reaction from

formalism, and from narrow and loveless discipline. He exhibits it as a corporate reaction. We may add that at least remarkably often it is the same with individuals. St. Paul was 'as touching the law a Pharisee . . . touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless'; and for him Christianity is reaction from legalism to liberty. St. Peter was the very type of the generous and impulsive character, which needed discipline; and for him Christianity was a school of diligence in faithful service. William Law, again, the man of argument and uncompromising logic, became the chief English Mystic of his time. John Wesley was known at Oxford as the man of Method; living, with his friends, by careful rule; but Bohler, the Moravian, wonderfully changed him; and the Wesley who could not suit his colonial congregation is hardly recognizable in the mission preacher of later years. So we have the strange phenomenon of the society which represents the influence of the later Wesley being commonly called by the name of Methodist, as if discipline and ecclesiastical order were their distinguishing characteristic. In Tauler we have another instance of the same change.

Nowadays we see a reaction from individualism amongst the so-called Free Churches, which Harnack denounces as apostasy from Protestantism. We have also seen the beginnings of reaction amongst Catholic Churchmen towards something like the spirit of Wesley himself; and notable High Churchmen have been wildly recommended to be openly either Romanists or Methodist ministers. But a great many of the younger generation feel that that movement has not yet become sufficiently conscious or confident, and that God is waiting to do much more for us so soon as we are ready. What would have happened if the English Church had been disestablished before the Oxford Movement it is appalling to imagine. That Movement has laid invaluable ecclesiastical foundations. Of much that was intolerable the Church has been emptied and swept clean. With much necessary furniture she is already garnished, and a crisis is upon her. And though we may be far from thinking that this process of preparation is complete, or

that the Oxford Movement has yet fully won the battle for Catholic Order and Tradition, does it not seem that so far as the Movement has failed it is because it has as a movement stood too exclusively for Discipline rather than Mysticism, for corporate organization rather than for individual spirituality? The men who have really carried it forward have mostly been men who, except when forced into defensive controversy, have taken such ecclesiastical foundations for granted, and have aimed at the edification of spiritual life. And a reaction towards mysticism in the ranks of those who have inherited the traditions of the Catholic Revival would do more by the way to spread the spirit of Catholicism than all the ecclesiology and liturgiology in Christendom, necessary as those sciences are. These things ought we to do, and not to leave the other undone. An influential writer has bidden us learn from the Welsh Revival our need of freedom, spontaneity, and expectation in the spiritual life, first individually, then corporately. The spirit of prayer and of spiritual hope and courage, and consciousness of our need of God the Holy Ghost, this is our characteristic need to-day: and we shall find the literature of this best after all, not so much in the writings of modern Protestantism as in the works of the Catholic Mystics. Externally, no doubt, the Mystics are antique, and we perhaps recognize the privilege of being modern. But essentially the Mystics are eternal, and essentially eternal is what we need to be, whether we be modern or mediæval. And in the senior members of the Society of St. John the Evangelist of Cowley St John we have a school of living mystics, saints, Catholics, and men of the highest and most attractive culture, in whose writings we have an introduction to the essence of Christian Mysticism, which we of these hurrying days shall do wisely to appreciate. To the works of Father Benson and Father Congreve there are many who owe much for striving to bring into the things of common life something of the radiance of 'the uncreated Beauty.' In Father Hollings' *Porta Regalis* we have the heart of the mediæval mystical lore, written with wholly practical aim for ordinary people by one to whom the spirit of prayer

had been the spirit of the labour and experience of a lifetime.

Perhaps, however, we feel that mysticism is in danger of becoming an intellectual fashion in some directions, and of being practically revived in very questionable forms in others. The latter danger is alluded to by Dr. Inge, in the introduction to his extracts from the German Mystics, issued under the name of *Light, Life, and Love*.¹ Dr. Inge minimizes the doctrinal unorthodoxy of the German Mystics, but is a very severe critic of what he considers the unwholesome vagaries of 'poor Suso' and his imitators, and is very apprehensive of unwholesome developments in the twentieth century. The dominant note of American religion to-day is said to be a craving for spiritual experiences as combined with impatience of theology and thought. Mrs. Eddy's immeasurably self-confident and widely influential *Science and Health* is simply mysticism run mad, intensely practical and intensely contemptuous of the Schools, whether theological or philosophical. The 'New Thought' writers, of whom R. W. Trine is representative, are mystics who are nearer the Schools, but are so thoroughly mystical that it is hard to estimate their exact relation to them; and they are hardly careful of it, one would say, themselves. And the leaders of the Spiritual Healing movement write so unguardedly of man's union with God as his 'Divinity' and 'Oneness with the Father in essence and substance,' that one wonders what is to come of such carelessness of traditional phraseology in the hands of people whose influence in some quarters seems to grow by leaps and bounds.

In view of the practical importance which these contemporary developments are lending, for watchful people, to the past history of mysticism, the popularity in certain quarters of the intellectual study of mysticism, which is due mainly to Dr. Inge's Bampton Lectures on Christian Mysticism, may be regarded as of some degree of value. And to those who cannot reach this larger work we can heartily recommend Miss Eleanor Gregory's shilling *Introduction to*

¹ 'Library of Devotion' (Methuen).

Christian Mysticism, mentioned at the head of this article, which is admirable alike in its compression and in the wisdom of its criticism and exposition. Of twenty-five or thirty typical mystics, she speaks with a discriminating sympathy which is more encouraging than anything else on the subject we have met with ; and her summary of the characteristic features of mysticism, and of its dangers and their safeguards, makes us, but for one consideration, wish that she had expanded this work tenfold. That consideration is the danger of glib controversy about 'the Inner Life' by lesser people, who follow even spiritual fashions to their own undoing. We ourselves have had our real help in these matters from the school of devotional writers alluded to above, whose aim is humbly and penitently practical, who dread intensely the danger of unreality and self-deception, and who, though they are perhaps the most real mystics in the Church of England, probably neither care to claim the name nor use the word. For the purposes of the present article the word has been inevitable: it is a key-word to Dr. Bigg's book ; numbers of books are being written about mysticism, and it seemed worth while to insist upon the prominent mystical element in some of the popular American systems of religious thought and practice of to-day and of to-morrow. But for ourselves we feel strongly that without trying to be mystics or disciplinarians or anything else with a literary name ourselves, and without copying anybody's peculiarities, we very sorely need to learn the abiding lesson that the mystics teach us, as well by their example as by their writings, the lesson of the search for God for His own sake, as the only worthy object of existence and the substance of eternal life itself. They will recall us to the love of God as the first great commandment, and the only true foundation for the second. They will teach us the vital and paramount importance of abiding in the True Vine, as the indispensable condition of any true fruitfulness of service. Through them God will call some to sacrifice all else to the pursuit of the life of contemplation, or the practice of the presence of God, in which some perfect souls attain to an habitual adherence to God with the affections and will,

and to an almost uninterrupted attention to Him with the sub-conscious mind, while the understanding is free to attend to ordinary business ; a busy life perhaps in quiet ways, and for the perfect perhaps a very busy life, like our Lord's earthly ministry ; but a peaceful life of wisdom, power, and unruffled charity, in which the soul abides wholly in God, and God abides in the soul, illuminating it with His Divine Light, strengthening it with His Divine Life, and binding it to Himself and to all the saints in the bonds of the Divine Spirit of Love, Who is the eternal relationship between the Father who begat us and the Son in whom we are begotten.

ART. V.—JAMES REDFERN, SCULPTOR.

1. *The Hampstead Annual*, 1902. (Hampstead : Sydney C. Mayle, 1902.)
 2. *The Dictionary of National Biography*. (London : Smith, Elder and Co., 1885-1904.)
 3. *Royal Academy Catalogues*, 1861-1876.
 4. *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement*. By WILFRID WARD. Second Edition. (London : Macmillan & Co., 1890.)
 5. *Personal and Professional Recollections*. By Sir G. GILBERT SCOTT, R.A. (London : Sampson Low, 1879.)
 6. *Memoir of George Edmund Street, R.A.* By A. E. STREET. (London : John Murray, 1888.)
 7. *Letter to the Subscribers for Building a New Nave*. By the DEAN OF BRISTOL [G. ELLIOT]. With Appendix of Correspondence. (Bristol : J. E. Chilcott, 1876.)
- Various other Works, including Periodicals, Journals, and Pamphlets.
- Private and unpublished materials.

WHILE every human life, rightly regarded, is an interesting object of study, there is, perhaps, a special charm in tracing the career of an artist ; and the fascination is surely enhanced if he rise from circumstances in which there is little

to encourage his development, and if his life-work form part of a great æsthetic and religious movement.

James Frank Redfern, sculptor, was born on January 14, 1838, at Hartington, in Dovedale. He was the only surviving son of a mason,¹ whose untimely death deprived him, at the age of about six years, of what little chance of encouragement his childhood possessed, leaving him to the companionship of a mother and sister, to whom his innate tendency toward art was always more or less incomprehensible. Yet, whether with sympathy or without it, he was constantly at work, trying to reproduce the forms of familiar objects, not only by drawing, but also by carving. Among his earliest materials was 'idleback'—that is, the remains of the plaster-of-Paris moulds from a neighbouring pottery. With this substance, which was used for whitening the cottage hearths, he drew his first sketches, and it presently became the material of his earliest attempts at sculpture—figures of dogs or sheep, or even a group of Samson and the lion. These efforts were often destroyed by his sister for the purposes of whitening; but a 'Sleeping Child,' carved when he was about seven, is said to be preserved at Poole's Cavern, Buxton. His favourite and, indeed, only tool, a pocket-knife, was also employed upon wood (in which he carved a little bust of Shakespeare), and later upon the soft alabaster of the Peak district; and a quaint fancy, it is said, would occasionally lead him to place some specimen of his work on a gate-post by the roadside, as if to see what effect it would have upon the passer-by. His early addiction to carving had been encouraged by a scarcity of drawing materials; but as soon as he could attain to lead pencils, cheap water-colours, and such paper as the village grocer could supply, he essayed sketching from nature. He was keenly alive to the beauty of the limestone scenery around his native village, and to the picturesqueness of several historic houses; and his parish church especially—St. Giles, Hartington, an ancient building of several periods—taught him something of practical perspective and of Gothic architecture. So proficient did he become that some

¹ According to another account his father was a sign-painter.

of his sketches were to have been used for a book (unfinished) on the scenery of Derbyshire, by Dr. Tooth, the incumbent of Biggin, near Hartington. This habit of drawing and painting remained with him through life, and it was his belief that an artist should be ever in practice, if not in his own branch of art, then in some other. He had little sense of colour, but an excellent eye for form, and in later life became a prolific draughtsman, filling even his letters with admirable sketches, comic and otherwise, and dotting down in numerous notebooks the slight but telling records of attitudes which had caught his eye, or ideas for artistic compositions; for often a drawing was the first stage in the evolution of a sculpture. The power thus early acquired of representing solid objects on the flat by perspective and shading, as well as in the round by carving, helps to explain a faculty which he developed for carving and modelling from woodcuts of sculpture in such papers as the *Illustrated London News*—a faculty which was to have an important bearing upon his prospects. At that time, however, his bent seemed likely to be thwarted by his mother, to whom her son's dallying with knife and pencil seemed idle and unprofitable, as is shewn by her remark that 'Jim was only fit to go about with a Punch and Judy show to cut the dolls!' Some attempts, indeed, were made to enforce a more regular occupation, and once he was actually apprenticed to a tailor—only to run away home at the end of a fortnight.

The details of his release from these difficulties are not very clear. It would seem that his talent aroused no effective interest in those about him till he was in his teens, when he received some timely encouragement from the Rev. Augustus Wirgman, Vicar of Hartington (1855-75) and previously curate of Hognaston and Bradbourne about eight and six miles distant; also from the Rev. Benjamin Webb, Perpetual Curate from 1851 to 1862 of Sheen, on the Staffordshire side of the Dove, scarcely two miles above Hartington. This was the beginning of a warm and lasting friendship between the young artist and the Wirgman and Webb families. Having heard of the lad's talent, Mr. Webb, who was an authority on ecclesiastical art, visited

the Redferns' cottage, and was much struck with what he saw there. Redfern was invited to Sheen Parsonage, and it was there, apparently, that he beheld for the first time a piece of actual sculpture—a bust by Chantrey—and so moved was he by this revelation of the possibilities of his art (the work of a man who had come from the same district and had risen from beginnings not unlike his own) that he actually burst into tears. A specimen of his efforts at this period—a little figure of Eve at the fountain, carved in alabaster (picked up, it is said, in the road), from a woodcut of E. H. Baily's celebrated statue—remains in Mr. Webb's family to shew what his unaided talent could do.

The means of training that talent came at last in a somewhat picturesque manner. Redfern (at the suggestion, we believe, of Mr. Wirgman or of a lady in a neighbouring village, the wife of a clergyman) had carved a remarkable little copy of J. G. Lough's then celebrated group 'Mourners,' representing a horse standing over a dead warrior,¹ whose head is supported by his wife. This copy was carved, it is said, out of a lump of alabaster with a pocket-knife from a woodcut in an illustrated paper; and, after suggestions that it should be sent to London or shewn to the then Duke of Devonshire, it was eventually brought to the notice of that staunch High Churchman, respected politician, and munificent church-builder, Mr. A. J. B. Beresford-Hope. This gentleman, on whose land Redfern is said to have been born, was already a person of importance in the neighbourhood when in 1854 he inherited from his step-father, the victor of Albuera, the neighbouring estate of Beresford Hall. He was a College friend of Mr. Webb, whom he had presented to the living of Sheen, and visited him from time to time at the parsonage; and it was Mr. Webb, doubtless, who brought Redfern to his notice. The young sculptor's talent, aided perhaps by his natural grace of manner, made sufficient impression upon Mr. Beresford-Hope to induce him to interest himself in the case.² As a preliminary,

¹ Not 'a warrior and a dead horse' (*Dict. Nat. Biog. s.v. Redfern* following *Art Journal*, 1876, p. 276).

² The credit of having 'discovered' Redfern and introduced him to

therefore, the lad was placed under the schoolmaster (Mr. H. Colson, succeeded in April 1857 by Mr. Jesse Brown) at Sheen. Here, in 1856, he was learning such subjects as Latin and mensuration, which shews that he must have acquired some elementary education before that date. It appears that he came to the schoolmaster's house at Sheen in January 1857. In addition to his work with the schoolmaster, he read with the Rev. Thomas E. Heygate, who was curate of

Mr. Beresford-Hope seems to be assigned in the *Hampstead Annual*, 1902 (by Mr. D. Davies, a friend and fellow-student), entirely to Mr. Wirgman; and this view seems to be taken by certain accounts of Redfern in local papers, and by the account of him in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (following the *Art Journal*). But in its article on Mr. Webb (by his son, Mr. C. C. J. Webb) the *Dictionary* clearly holds that it was Mr. Webb who brought the sculptor into notice ('his discovery, as it may be called, of J. F. Redfern'), though when its own reference to its own account of Redfern (by Mr. Campbell Dodgson) is referred to no mention of Mr. Webb is there to be found. The theory that it was the latter who introduced the sculptor to Mr. Beresford-Hope, is not only supported by the tradition of Mr. Webb's family, and apparently of Mr. Beresford-Hope's also, but is confirmed by the words of Mr. Webb himself in an address delivered to the St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society, in St. Andrew's, Wells Street, on April 30, 1881, when he expressly stated that 'he spoke to Mr. Beresford-Hope' about the lad. The *Hampstead Annual* states that Mr. Wirgman carried Redfern's work, the 'Mourners,' to Beresford Hall; but during a part at least of this period that mansion was in ruins and Mr. Beresford-Hope stayed elsewhere, as for instance with Mr. Webb, whose intimate friend he had been since their days at Trinity College, Cambridge.

Mr. Webb, in the above address, states that he heard of Redfern from some one else. His first mention of him in his diaries is apparently under April 5, 1856, when he records that the lad came to Sheen. The 'discovery' therefore took place before that date, and so did the introduction to Mr. Beresford-Hope, for Redfern was already attending Sheen school in August 1856. It is possible, then, that Mr. Wirgman, who was 'admitted' to Hartington in 1855, was the discoverer (he is said to have noticed Redfern when on his first round of parochial visits: *High Peak News*, July 10, 1875), unless indeed Redfern is right in implying, in a letter written long afterwards, that he may have been introduced to Mr. Beresford-Hope in 1854.

At least Mr. Wirgman may have introduced Redfern to Mr. Webb. The latter's diaries, however, though they frequently mention visits from or to Mr. Wirgman, contain apparently no allusion to him in connection with Redfern.

the parish under Mr. Webb from 1853 to 1862, and then incumbent. He visited also at Mr. Webb's parsonage, where he met Mr. and Lady Mildred Beresford-Hope. He joined the choir at Sheen Church, which Mr. Beresford-Hope had caused to be remodelled by Butterfield, and in which daily services were maintained at Mr. Beresford-Hope's expense. (Before this Redfern had apparently been a Wesleyan—at least he had attended a Wesleyan Sunday school at Hartington in 1852.) While at Sheen he found leisure to illustrate a story written and afterwards published by the schoolmaster, who gave the hero the name of Redfern.¹ On June 17, 1857, he was taken by Mr. Webb to the Manchester Exhibition of Art Treasures, which included 160 works of sculpture by old and modern masters—among them Baily's 'Eve at the Fountain.'

It was apparently in the winter of this year that he left his native district to be launched by Mr. Beresford-Hope into the art world of London. As to the means of introducing him thereto, his patron had consulted Mr. John Clayton (of Clayton & Bell), and that eminent artist, then almost fresh from his own training in sculpture at the Royal Academy, agreed to take Redfern in 1858 as a pupil without articles. It was in a studio at 24A Cardington Street, Hampstead Road, that the latter began his studies, which were principally directed to the acquisition of a good grounding in the grammar of his art. His master's method of teaching him was an interesting one. A book containing illustrations of the human form in vigorous action was set before the pupil, who was required to copy them, representing the figures, however, as nude. Having thus taken off the clothing, he was next told to remove the skin and to shew the play of the muscles, with the aid of books on anatomy. In this way he gained a good knowledge of superficial anatomy in a remarkably short time. It was as a student's exercise in anatomy that he modelled a remarkable group of Cain slaying Abel.

¹ *Without a Friend in the World*, by the author of *Worth her Weight in Gold* [H. Colson] (London: William Macintosh, 1866). Of the three woodcuts, two—one (frontispiece) of considerable merit—bear the initials J. F. R. They represent figure subjects.

This task was executed from Mr. Clayton's design and under his supervision, but no small credit must still belong to the hand which modelled so fine a work. 'Cain and Abel' was exhibited at the Academy in 1859, and (doubtless by Mr. Clayton's express wish) under Redfern's own name. It was praised in the *Royal Academy Review* as being 'of great promise,' and is said to have been admired by J. H. Foley, R.A. During his time with Mr. Clayton, which lasted a year or more, Redfern became acquainted with Mr. H. Stacy Marks; and at the Antique School of the Academy he began in November 1859 a life-long friendship with his fellow-sculptor, Mr. D. Davies. After a short time, however, he abandoned his studies at the Academy as uncongenial.

Either at this period or a little later, he assisted Mr. Clayton at a studio in Clipstone Street, Fitzroy Square, in modelling, from the latter's design, the Crucifix, and perhaps also the group representing the Ascension, for the reredos of Sir Gilbert Scott's great Lutheran church at Hamburg, and the St. George and Dragon for the same architect's Crimea Memorial in Broad Sanctuary, Westminster.

At Mr. Clayton's suggestion (supported, it is said, by Sir Gilbert Scott), Mr. Beresford-Hope in 1860 sent Redfern to Paris. In that home of art the young sculptor remained some six months or more. French methods of study he found more congenial than those of the Academy, since in Paris the Antique was rendered less deadening by being made to interpret the Life. On one occasion, when bullied by fellow-students, he shewed fight. He is said to have acquired French and seen something of the Ateliers; but though he appreciated and profited by the advantages of Parisian art life, he was never the typical student of the Latin Quarter, and he was repelled by the laxity of Parisian morals. It is noteworthy that he made a special study of some of the best monuments of French Gothic, including the cathedrals of Rouen and Amiens, and that he was especially impressed by the sculptures on the portals of the latter building.

In that or the following year he returned to London, and

lodged at 8 Roxburgh Terrace, Haverstock Hill. Mr. Clayton, who had urged a much longer studentship in Paris, now offered to induce his friend, J. H. Foley, R.A., to take Redfern into his studio as an 'improver' and assistant, but Mr. Beresford-Hope contended that by this time the young man ought to be earning his own living, and on this ground withdrew his pecuniary aid. Thus after a somewhat short training, and without having as yet shewn any pre-eminent power of design, Redfern was suddenly thrown upon his own resources. To some this has seemed the turning-point in his life. What effect a longer stay in Paris or an apprenticeship to Foley might have had in developing his creative power, or possibly changing his artistic aim, it is difficult to say. As it was, his career took the direction indicated by the environment in which he had been brought up.

The period of his childhood was that of a crisis in the history of the English Church, and in youth he had been surrounded with an atmosphere in which art was closely associated with religion. Redfern was born, and Webb and Beresford-Hope went to Cambridge, just when the Tractarian Revival was at its height in the sister University. That movement had already done much to renew the corporate life of the Church; it was now to extend its influence to her art also. The interest aroused long before the close of the eighteenth century in mediæval architecture had already produced a considerable number of modern Gothic churches. These buildings, however, were singularly unlike their mediæval originals, a fact due largely to the change which had come over public worship during the past three centuries. In fact, the churches of the early Gothic Revival reflected the Protestantism of their builders, being planned for a simple worship in which particular importance was assigned to the sermon; while the mediæval churches had been planned to enshrine an elaborate ceremonial which demanded a marked separation of clergy and choir from the body of the worshippers, and paid especial reverence to the altar. If, then, modern and mediæval churches were to be made more alike, the attainment of that result would be materially aided by a revival of interest in Catholic ritual. The close relation

between the art of the Middle Ages and their religious atmosphere was indeed clearly perceived by the great champion of the early Gothic Revival, A. W. N. Pugin. To him that atmosphere was represented in his own day by the Church of Rome, which he was led to join; but nevertheless at this very period reasons were being supplied at Oxford why the ancient ritual which had so moulded church architecture before the Reformation should have a perfectly rational interest for the reformed, but still Catholic, Church of England—the body which must always be ‘in this realm’ the chief patron of ecclesiastical art; and in the effect produced upon that art by the sense of the historical continuity of the Anglican Church lies the main connexion between the Gothic Revival and the Oxford Movement.¹ Pugin, who believed that an enthusiasm for Gothic was a necessary accompaniment of the true Catholic spirit, must naturally have identified that spirit with his own Church. Nevertheless, better artist than Romanist, after visiting Oxford in 1840, he sought to enlist Tractarian sympathies in the Gothic cause; but the indifference of Ward (as afterwards of Newman and Faber) drove him to despair, and in spite of the æsthetic and antiquarian piety of a section led by Pugin’s friend and host, Dr. Bloxam of Magdalen, ‘father of Ritualism,’ the Oxford men as a body did little for the spreading of Gothic principles. It was, indeed, at the sister University that the æsthetic side of Tractarianism was to be most effectively worked out through the labours of the Cambridge Camden Society,² a body which, it has been said, created the science of Ecclesiology and was the immediate cause of that revolution in church fabrics and worship which marked the second quarter of the nineteenth century. With this enterprise Redfern’s two early patrons were intimately associated from its beginning; and to the end of their lives they were among the

¹ The two movements acted and reacted upon each other. Thus it is also true that ‘the study and careful reproduction of mediæval churches necessarily led to a desire to restore the forms of service for which they were designed.’ (Bishop Westcott, *Lessons from Work*, 1901, p. 24.)

² After it had become (in 1846) the Ecclesiological Society in London, it was reinforced with Oxford men.

chief upholders of the principles it represented. Mr. Webb was one of the Society's founders (1839), and was Secretary till its extinction in the sixties. He wrote much on Ecclesiology and was the expert adviser of William Butterfield; and he shares with A. W. N. Pugin the credit of having imparted the true spirit of Gothic to Sir Gilbert Scott. He also assisted the career of George Edmund Street, and was consulted on ecclesiological matters by Dr. Pusey. In later life, as holder of an important living in London and prebendary of St. Paul's, he made his church an example of the artistic and impressive conduct of Anglican worship.¹ Beresford-Hope was one of the original members of the Society, and afterwards President. He both wrote and lectured on art, and he wrote largely upon Ritual, his opinions gaining additional weight from his public position and wealth. He it was who employed Butterfield to remodel St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, and to build All Saints', Margaret Street; and he eventually became President of the Architectural Museum, and even of the Institute of British Architects.

The colour imparted by such men to the mind of Redfern was deepened by his studies under a partner in the firm of Clayton & Bell; for though Mr. Clayton did not consciously prepare his pupil for one branch of sculpture rather than for another, the latter's art could not but acquire in that studio a tinge of Gothic feeling. This tendency, confirmed by the glories of the great French churches, overbore, yet did not paralyze, the counter-influences of the Academy and the Ateliers. Thus he gradually arrived at what was, perhaps, his particular rôle in sculpture—that of clothing with the grace of modern anatomy conceptions animated by the mediæval spirit. For sculpture in the mediæval manner the progress of the Gothic Revival had created a large demand, and he was in a favourable position to obtain introductions, through Mr. Beresford-Hope and other friends, to various patrons of the mediæval style and professional exponents of it, including such men as Sir Gilbert Scott (for whom he had worked, indirectly, on two occasions) and G. E. Street. He became therefore in the

¹ From 1881 to 1885 he was Editor of this Review.

main an architectural sculptor, and eventually one of the most admired adorners of the churches erected or restored in his day under the influence of the Gothic Revival.

In 1861 (not long, therefore, after his return from Paris) a small panel in low relief, representing the Holy Family, was accepted at the Academy. In this fine work the Infant Saviour was represented in the arms of St. Joseph, against whose shoulder rested the head of the Blessed Mother. Both the adult figures were represented standing. The sculptor presented this panel, or a replica of it, to Mrs. Wirgman.

The next year brought him his first commission. It was for a stone panel of the Resurrection, to be placed over the doorway of the Digby Mortuary Chapel,¹ erected by Mr. G. Wingfield Digby in the cemetery at Sherborne. This panel, which fills the tympanum under a pointed arch, was awarded an honourable mention in the same year at the London International Exhibition. In 1863 he exhibited at the Academy a bas-relief of the Good Samaritan, of which F. Turner Palgrave wrote that 'though stiffly modelled in parts' it shewed 'some originality.' He was now working at 29 Clipstone Street, Fitzroy Square.

From this year till his death Redfern was, with one break (1870-1872 inclusive), an annual exhibitor at the Academy,² whose catalogues alone would serve to shew that his work was by no means always of an architectural or sacred character. Occasionally he treated a classical subject, and in 1864 exhibited a life-size group of 'Nymph Diana and Cupid,' inspired by the 153rd Sonnet of Shakespeare. He also executed a considerable number of portraits, among which may be mentioned two marble medallions (one exhibited in 1866) of

¹ With Mr. W. Slater, architect of this chapel, Redfern was associated on various other occasions, as at Bridgnorth, where he executed a circular medallion of angels in St. Leonard's Church, and apparently at Limerick. A landscape which he painted in 1862 is reproduced in the *Hampstead Annual*, 1902, p. 60.

² He exhibited also in 1864 statuettes of the Prince and Princess of Wales at the Society of British Artists (A. Graves, *Dictionary of Artists* 1895), and in 1876 a wood nymph at the Royal Aquarium.

members of the Beresford-Hope family,¹ a recumbent effigy in alabaster of Lady Cope, the placing of which in Eversley church in 1865 brought him into contact with Charles Kingsley,² and a statue (executed about 1873) two-thirds life-size, of the seventh Duke of Devonshire—in front of the Laboratory in Silver Street, Cambridge.³

It was apparently about 1863 that he was commissioned for three sculptures for the Westropp monument in Limerick Cathedral; and soon after 1867 he produced four figures of angels playing musical instruments for the tomb of Bishop Lonsdale in the Cathedral at Lichfield. About 1868 he executed another commission for the Digby chapel at Sherborne—a marble panel of the Entombment which was in the Academy of that year. This panel occupies the tympanum under a rounded arch, whose deep mouldings cast over it a mellow shade. The design is very skilfully adapted to the shape of the tympanum. Though the feeling is sufficiently Gothic, there is none of that stiff attenuation which was sometimes affected, in painful subjects, by the mediæval sculptors, and the figure of the Saviour is admirably modelled.

In 1867 Redfern had married Miss Allen, of Clifton House, Hampstead, and afterwards took up his abode at Woburn House, Pond Street, hard by, having lived for two years previously at what is now 15 Mansfield Road, in the same neighbourhood. In 1866 or 1867 he changed his studio

¹ As Mr. Beresford-Hope's building enterprises had been mostly completed before Redfern was qualified, he could not himself give the latter many commissions for church decoration. Redfern, however, executed for him a reredos for Kilndown, Kent, and some designs (for heads in inlaid woodwork) for Trinity College, Cambridge.

² In a letter written at the time he describes how Kingsley came into the church to watch, and how, when interested and excited, the great writer stuttered so much as to be almost unintelligible.

³ His numerous other secular works include at least ten portrait busts, some in marble (of which three, Sir W. Cope, Mr. G. W. Digby, and Mrs. Pim, were at the R.A. in 1865, 1867, and 1875 respectively), a sketch for a statue of Macaulay (R.A. 1863), a bas-relief of Commerce for the Finance Company's building in the City, under Mr. Somers Clarke (it is doubtful whether this was ever erected), and several classical and other works.

in Clipstone Street for another at 105 Charlotte Street, also near Fitzroy Square. His marriage profoundly influenced his career. A man of strong affections, he was devoted to his home, and this feeling was reflected in his work, so that often the pose or expression of sculptured saint or angel was inspired by some characteristic habit of his wife. He was married at St. Andrew's, Wells Street, a church for which, about this period, he was executing one of his most important works, and of which the Vicar was no other than his old friend Mr. Benjamin Webb. Mr. Webb had been summoned from Sheen to the living of St. Andrew's in 1862, and shortly afterwards had begun to improve his new church in accordance with true ecclesiological principles, calling to his aid Messrs. Clayton and Bell and his old friends Redfern and Street. Among his additions was the chancel with its magnificent reredos, which rises on either side of the east window almost to the roof. Of this reredos, which took about seven years (1865-1872) to complete, the architecture was by Street, while the ten separate figures and the seven groups in high relief (the latter executed about 1867-1870) were the independent work of Redfern. Two of the groups were given by the Webb family¹ and one ('Our Lord in Majesty') contains figures of the patron saints of the Ecclesiological Society, St. John the Evangelist, St. Luke, St. Etheldreda, and St. George.² The five groups in the lowest tier (The Martyrdom of St. Andrew, Christ bearing the Cross, the Crucifixion, the Descent from the Cross, and the Martyrdom of St. Peter) are perhaps the most elaborate works Redfern ever produced. According to his frequent practice, he made a

¹ The first erected—the Crucifixion—given in memory of the vicar's brother, Mr. George Webb, represented in the left-hand corner, kneeling, the robes of a Common Councillor; and the last erected—the Resurrection—in memory of the vicar's father, Mr. Benjamin Webb, sen. This group is somewhat original in representing the ascending Saviour almost in profile.

² It was given with the surplus fund of the Society on its extinction in 1868. Of the six figures in the uppermost tier of the reredos, those on the left (SS. Paul, Peter, and Andrew) stand for the Church Catholic; those on the right (SS. Alban, Helena, and Augustine of Canterbury) for the Church in England.

careful study for them in pen and ink, shading the background, and drawing in the outline of the architectural setting; and for the second-mentioned group, at least one scheme of composition was rejected. Crowded with incident as they are, and executed in choice alabaster,¹ they exhibit not only his skill in the working of that material, but the very considerable powers of design to which he had now attained.

He afterwards presented Mrs. Webb with alabaster replicas of the figures representing the Annunciation which surmount the central panel.² It has been written of this reredos that 'if it were in any foreign church it would be marked by Baedeker with a star and everyone would go to look at it, even though the church were darker than St. Andrew's, and the street dirtier than Wells Street.' There is, however, some other work of his, also in London, which is gazed upon every day by hundreds, who neither know, nor perhaps care, who designed it.

Redfern was the designer of the eight bronze gilt figures of Virtues, and apparently of four of the bronze gilt angels³ in the *flèche* of the Albert Memorial. Particularly charming is the figure of Charity, crowned and carrying a burning heart. These figures, of colossal size, were cast by Skidmore from models prepared by Redfern on a small scale. Sir Gilbert Scott, by whom Redfern had been appointed, wrote

¹ In the 'Martyrdom of St. Peter' the design harmonizes interestingly with the variation of colour in the material. In the 'Crucifixion' the alabaster was almost pure white; but London atmosphere had already begun to injure these five groups before the reredos was completed, and the two groups in the second tier were therefore executed in Caen stone.

² Two of the four alabaster statuettes (the Archangels Michael and Gabriel, the Blessed Virgin, and the Archangel Raphael) below the sill of the window.

³ So the *Hampstead Annual*, 1902, following Redfern himself and corroborated by other evidence, including the influentially signed memorial presented to the Queen after his death. Sir G. G. Scott also says that Redfern modelled the greater part of the figures in the *flèche* (*Personal and Professional Recollections*, p. 265). Yet Mr. D. C. Bell, in *The National Memorial to H.R.H. the Prince Consort*, says (p. 93) that all the eight angels at the summit were designed by J. B. Philip.

that the models were 'much superior to the execution in metal.' The metal figures were nearly all finished in 1869, when Fortitude (presumably the model) was exhibited at the Academy.¹ Another work of his which should be familiar to many is the colossal figure of 'Our Lord in Majesty,' over the doorway of the Chapter-House at Westminster Abbey. Here again he was working under Scott, who had begun to restore the Chapter-House about 1865; and a share in the adornment of that splendid room was also taken by Mr. Webb, who penned the inscriptions for the windows.

In 1869 Redfern moved to 25 Queen Anne Street, Cavendish Square, a house with a studio attached. Here he lived till (apparently in 1874) his wife's health compelled them to return to Hampstead, where they settled at Lower Mount Cottage (now demolished). He retained the studio in Queen Anne Street, however, till his death, and from about 1873 onwards he had an additional studio in Harley Mews North.

In 1870-1871 he executed the celebrated font of Inverness Cathedral—a large marble figure of a kneeling angel holding a shell. The idea was taken from a well-known statue by Thorwaldsen; but Redfern would never copy slavishly another man's work, and treated the borrowed conception in his own fashion. The features are said to be those of Mrs. Learmouth, wife of Colonel Learmouth,² and the font was apparently presented to the Cathedral through the Bishop of Moray, Ross, and Caithness (Dr. Robert Eden). Redfern executed a marble replica of this font (with different features, apparently) for St. Bartholomew's, New York; and a plaster cast has been recently presented by his daughter to All Hallows', St. Pancras, London. Except here and in Wells Street, there is little of his work in the parish churches of the Metropolis. An interesting

¹ The *Dict. Nat. Biog.* says that Redfern 'carved [*sic*] the figure of Fortitude on the Albert Memorial,' and is apparently unaware that he was responsible for any of the other figures. In this Dictionary, as in Redgrave's *Dictionary of Artists*, and in obituary notices, the list given of his works is exceedingly meagre.

² Among Redfern's portrait works was a bust of this lady.

example of it, however, is to be seen in St. Stephen's, Lewisham, where the reredos contains a large panel, representing the Institution of the Holy Communion. The idea for this work, which was exhibited (presumably in plaster) at the Academy in 1874, is said to have been taken from a picture which hung in the temporary chapel of Keble College, Oxford, and that may itself have been copied from another picture in Lord Beauchamp's parish church at Madresfield. The Apostles are represented in the attitude of worship; and as a controversy was raging at the time about the two Sacramental Lights upon the Holy Table, it is worthy of remark that two candlesticks were introduced upon the Table in his sculpture. Technically, this panel is remarkable for the fact that it is elaborately coloured—whether by the suggestion of the sculptor or of Mr. Buckeridge¹ (the architect with whom he was associated) is not clear: but at any rate the selection of stone as the material which would take the colour best was largely due to Redfern. The practice of colouring stone sculpture was, of course, usual in the Middle Ages, but in 1874 it had not been widely revived, and some credit is due to those who had the courage to resort to it at that time. Another instance of the practice is to be seen at All Saints', Clifton, Bristol, a church designed by Street. Here again, the reredos contains a large panel by Redfern, (representing 'Our Lord in Majesty' adored by mediaeval and other saints), which is highly coloured and gilt. The colour was here applied by Messrs. Bell & Almond, under the sculptor's directions.

With Mr. Street, Redfern was associated on many occasions, and especially (from about 1870 onwards) in connection with numerous churches erected by Street in the East Riding of Yorkshire for Sir Tatton Sykes, whose acquaintance the sculptor seems to have made as early as 1862. Thus he produced some angels and five marble panels (the

¹ It was apparently under this architect that he produced three panels for the reredos at Little Houghton, Northants (1873), and three panels for a reredos and three figures for a rood screen at Llanfrechfa, Monmouth (1873). These rood figures are among the few works which he executed in wood.

Annunciation, the Crucifixion, the Entombment, the Walk to Emmaus, and one other subject) for the reredos at Garton—panels representing the first and the last two subjects and the Baptism were in the Academy of 1873—and some figures representing the Annunciation, and three marble panels (the Crucifixion and the Martyrdoms of SS. Peter and Andrew) for the reredos of Kirby Grindalyth. The two last-mentioned panels were exhibited in plaster in the Academy of 1876. At Kirby Grindalyth there is also a sculpture of 'Our Lord in Majesty' over the chancel arch.¹

In the West Riding some of his work (executed between about 1871 and 1875) may be seen in the two beautiful churches erected, the one by the present Marquis of Ripon at Studley Royal, and the other by Lady Mary Vyner at Skelton. At the latter church Redfern's work consists of the sculpture on the marble font, and some alabaster medallions in the reredos. The architect employed at both places was the eccentric William Burges, under whom Redfern was also engaged about 1873-1875 in the decoration of Cardiff Castle, then recently remodelled by Burges for the third Marquis of Bute.²

In 1875 he executed figures of six angels for the church at Hoar Cross, Staffordshire, under Mr. Bodley. An interesting commission on which he was engaged in 1874-1875 was for a bas-relief of the Entombment and other work for Wolsey's chapel (at Windsor Castle), which Sir Gilbert Scott had recently remodelled for Queen Victoria as a memorial to the Prince Consort.

¹ He also produced five marble panels for the reredos at Kirkburn, and statues (chiefly of patron saints) for Kirkburn, Helperthorpe, Weaverthorpe, Luttons Ambo (all for Sir Tatton Sykes, under Street), Boynton, and perhaps Bridlington. Nor must mention be omitted of four statues executed for the new buildings erected by Street for Dr. Thring at Uppingham.

² This important commission, never fully carried out, included apparently figures of Apollo, Henry I., Henry II., and the Empress Maud, bronze figures for a chandelier, a bronze statue of St. John, an eagle and four bas-reliefs. All these items seem to have been wholly or partially executed, besides eight personifications of towns and other work. One statue apparently was to be 'a man and horse.' He also produced for Mr. Burges (1874-5) a small figure of the Virgin and Child.

Under Scott he was also employed on the decoration of three cathedrals. Thus, between about 1868 and 1875, he executed the two alabaster figures (SS. Peter and Paul) on the pulpit, and the sitting figures of Apostles (except that of St. John) in the Octagon at Ely. Some of these had to be altered to fit their niches, but as a rule Redfern was careful to adapt his work exactly to its future position, and in one or two cases he seems to have even designed the niche as well as the statue to fill it.

But the commission which, for its mere magnitude, might take first place among those entrusted to him, was for the decoration of the west front of Salisbury Cathedral.¹ Here he was again working under Scott, and the task, which occupied him intermittently from about 1866 to 1876, involved the production of at least sixty statues, mostly of colossal size, and each, of course, a distinct and carefully thought-out creation. Of these, one of the most noticeable, perhaps, is that of the 'Virgin in Majesty.'

The cathedral, however, with which his memory is most worthily associated, is that of Gloucester, upon sculptures for which he was occupied from about 1869 onwards. The twelve figures on the south porch are his work, and so is the statuary (executed about 1870) in the reredos of St. Paul's chapel. The latter commission came from the third Lord Ellenborough, to whom Redfern was introduced by Sir Gilbert Scott. In the three panels of this reredos are statues of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Luke, and in the tabernacle work which forms the sides of the panels are numerous statuettes. The figure of St. Paul, with arms upraised, is at once vigorous and refined, and the smaller figures are graceful in pose and elaborate in execution—modern anatomy clad in the simple yet numerous and flowing folds of mediæval drapery—and the whole work harmonizes well with the ancient and delicate reredos which it fills. Redfern's also are the twelve statuettes in the canopies over the Sedilia. But his most important work here is in the Grand Reredos, for which in 1871 he made three separate sets of drawings. In

¹ See Sir G. G. Scott, *Personal and Professional Recollections*, p. 306. This work was very inadequately remunerated.

this case the reredos itself was entirely new—the creation of Scott—and consists of three large niches or tabernacles, alternating with four smaller niches, and surmounted by three complex pinnacles. All the figure sculpture here was designed and executed by Redfern. In each pinnacle are three angels bearing emblems of the Passion. Below, the smaller niches contain statues of Moses, St. Peter, St. Paul, and David, and in the great niches are fine groups of the Nativity, the Ascension, and the Descent from the Cross. Here again gilding and colour have been employed, the interior of the niches being tinted a deep red, against which the white of the sculpture is strongly relieved. The Nativity and the Descent have the effect of being somewhat cramped, and the central group is superior to them, its subject being more adaptable to the aspiring form of the niches. The figure of the ascending Saviour is particularly impressive. This reredos, which Redfern is said to have considered his finest work, was presented by the Freemasons of the Province or their treasurer, and on its inauguration in 1873 the sculptor was initiated into the Royal Gloucestershire Lodge. There is one more cathedral with the decoration of which he was associated, though not under the same architect. Among the commissions which employed him during 1874–1876 (throughout his career he generally had many works on hand at the same time) was one for twenty figures and a bas-relief for Street's new nave and porch at Bristol, the other cathedral, as it then was, of the same diocese.

Such quantities of work naturally could not be accomplished without aid, and there were generally several skilled workmen in attendance upon the sculptor; yet, after all allowances made, the amount of work he achieved in fifteen years is truly amazing.¹ Nor did sculpture exhaust the energies of

¹ Among his sacred works not already mentioned are a sculpture on the font at Moggerhanger (Beds.) and some sculptures for the reredos (executed in 1873) at Latton (? Wilts), and mention occurs in his papers of work done at Beddington (Surrey), St. James-the-Less, Westminster, St. Mark's, Kilburn (in 1875), and other places. Many papers, moreover, were destroyed after his death, nor perhaps can all of the numerous works recorded without particulars among the papers that remain, and in the

this remarkable and gifted man. In spare hours he was constantly drawing, or painting (in oil as well as in water-colour), or composing verses. Occasionally he wrote on Art, and penned prefaces for publications of the Fine Art Publishing Company of which he seems to have been a Director. Up to the time of his last illness he was actually writing a novel.

In spite, however, of his uncommon industry, he never succeeded in placing himself beyond the reach of financial cares. Like many artists, he was an indifferent man of business, and, being unwilling to assert himself, he often accepted for his labour a wholly inadequate remuneration. His later years were embittered by the grave financial difficulties in which he became involved; and even the natural pride of the artist in his work received a severe slight in the spring of 1876, when a serious controversy arose over the figures he had recently executed for the north porch of Bristol Cathedral. It does not seem to us necessary at the present day 'infandum renovare dolorem,' and we shall therefore confine what we have to say, so far as possible, to a statement of Redfern's work and its unhappy fate. The porch was the gift of Mr. W. K. Wait, M.P., offered in 1873, and based on a design of Street's in the Academy of 1868.¹ The execution was entrusted by Mr. Street to Redfern, who was engaged upon the sculptures for over a year, and in February-March, 1876, they were placed in position. The lofty arch that gave entrance to the porch was surmounted by a panel in relief, representing the Adoration of the Magi, in which the figures of the Mother and Child occupied, if we remember rightly, the centre of the composition. Below, a figure of the

inventory of the sale at his studios in 1876, be identified among those already mentioned. One of the many drawings, for instance, represents a figure (apparently for Louth, Lincs.), and another resembles the figure of 'Our Lord in Majesty' over the west door of St. Mary Abbots', Kensington, a church erected by Scott. Various casts of sacred and other works, among them one of a fine figure of St. Michael trampling on Satan, remain in the possession of his family and other persons.

¹ A perspective design of the porch, signed by Mr. Street and dated March 1867, is reproduced in Fergusson's *History of the Modern Styles of Architecture*, ii. 149.

Virgin was included among a number of seated statuettes of New Testament Saints which enriched the curves of the arch. In some niches on the buttresses and as it were guarding the doorway were large statues of the Four Doctors of the Latin Church, St. Ambrose being represented with the triple scourge, St. Augustine with the burning heart, St. Jerome in a Cardinal's hat, and St. Gregory wearing the Papal tiara, and with a dove upon his shoulder. Figures of the Four Doctors with the same emblems had, indeed, already been erected by Redfern (as he afterwards pointed out in a letter to the Dean) on the west front of Salisbury and on the south porch of Gloucester, then under the same Bishop (Dr. Ellicott) with Bristol, nor had any objection been raised at either place; and, further, the sculptor maintained that whatever objections might be made to the treatment 'the four standing figures were given the insignia invariably associated with the great Latin Fathers when grouped together.' At Bristol, however, it was otherwise. A violent agitation arose, directed against the Four Doctors, and especially too against the figures of the Virgin and Child. The Chapter met, under the presidency of the Dean, and passed a resolution (two members, however, dissenting), which authorized him to take such measures as he might think fit for removing the obnoxious statues. Two days later, accordingly, the figures were summarily removed. St. Gregory's cross, it is said, was broken in the process, and part of the stonework over St. Augustine's head knocked off. The Four Doctors, we believe, afterwards found a home at East Heslerton Church, Yorkshire (erected by Sir Tatton Sykes), but one of the two figures of the Virgin was irreparably injured—apparently the single figure. As there was not room to insert the chisel behind it, this unfortunate statuette lost the head and was broken into several pieces. The niches flanking the doorway were filled with figures of the Four Evangelists, but the Adoration of the Magi was allowed to remain, in spite of protests, apparently without alteration.¹ But by such treatment of his work the sensitive

¹ The Chapter's Resolution specifies two figures of the Virgin, one with and one without the Holy Child. A photograph of the front of the porch,

temperament of the artist was keenly affected; for the responsibility as to details of treatment in the different statues was not Mr. Street's, but his own.¹ His health at this time was rapidly failing. The strain of incessant toil, and the burden of financial anxieties—though he had been paid more liberally than he usually was at Bristol, where he received apparently about 100*l.* a statue for the Four Doctors—rendered heavier by the fact that he now had others dependent upon him, had gradually undermined his constitution. As the spring advanced, he became seriously ill. His trouble brought out the strength of old friendships, and, being still only thirty-eight, he was surrounded in his last days by the same friends whom he had known as a boy. Lying at Clifton House, Hampstead (long since demolished), the home of his wife's family, he was visited by Mr. Webb and Mr. Beresford-Hope, as well as by his old fellow-student, Mr. Davies, to whom it fell to warn him of the approaching end, which, as Redfern told Mr. Webb, he believed to have been accelerated by the Bristol affair. From his death-bed he wrote to the Dean of Gloucester, expressing his regret that he must bear no further part in the adornment of that cathedral, and to Mr. Clayton, whom he asked to befriend his wife and his two children, a request which afterwards met with a generous response. On Tuesday, June 13, 1876, he received the Holy Communion for the last time from the hands of his old

taken before the disturbance, shews a figure of the Virgin, without the Child, among the eight statuettes of New Testament Saints round the arch of the outer doorway, and above this doorway is the effective group of the Adoration of the Magi, in which, of course, the central figure is the Virgin and Child. No other figures of the Virgin are visible in the photograph. The Virgin and Child mentioned in the Resolution may, of course, have been a separate statue. It is, however, there described as 'above the door,' and the Dean is known to have objected to something in the above-mentioned group.

¹ The *Hampstead Annual*, 1902, quotes a statement that Redfern had 'warned the architect against making use of certain symbols,' but Mr. Street (though he strongly objected to the Dean's action) wrote to the *Bristol Times* (April 8, 1875), 'The adornment in detail of the statues is not my work'; and to the Dean (April 7), 'I think Mr. Redfern was injudicious in making so much of some of the insignia.' See also *Memoir of G. E. Street* (pp. 178-183).

friend Mr. Benjamin Webb. Among the sounds which reached his ears during his last hours was that of the carillon of St. Stephen's church, playing, as it happened, 'O Rest in the Lord,' one of his favourite airs, for like many painters and sculptors he loved music. On the same day he died, rejoicing that his art had been chiefly devoted to the glory of God. He was buried in the cemetery of St. John's Church, Hampstead.¹

The affection and respect in which his memory was held were shewn by the manner in which his brother-artists, including the Council of the Royal Academy, joined in coming forward to aid those whom he had left behind. About 1891 a pension on the Civil List was obtained for his widow through the exertions of Canon Girdlestone. A memorial praying Queen Victoria to grant a pension was signed by twenty-four Royal Academicians, the signatures including such names as F. Leighton, J. E. Millais, G. F. Watts, H. Stacy Marks, E. Poynter, J. L. Pearson, A. Waterhouse, and Thomas Woolner,² and contained these words: 'Those most competent to have an opinion on the particular branch of art which he [Redfern] chiefly cultivated were unanimous in thinking that England had lost in him no common man, and they deeply regret that he did not live to develop still further his rare gifts.'³

¹ An excellent portrait of Redfern is reproduced as frontispiece to the *Hampstead Annual*, 1902.

² Sir J. Edgar Boehm had also intended to sign, but was prevented by death.

³ The writer desires to record his great obligations to Miss M. K. Webb for searching Mr. Webb's diaries, and to Miss Redfern for going through her father's letters and papers.

ART. VI.—MOHAMMED AND THE RISE OF ISLAM.

Mohammed and the Rise of Islam. By D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.
—'Heroes of the Nations.' (New York and London :
G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905.)

AMONG the still open adventures in the field of biography that of the life of Muhammad undoubtedly ranks high. As regards importance, his was one of the dozen cardinal lives of the world, and as regards essential difficulty probably none other demands of its student a more varied combination of abstruse learning and absolute genius. All biography is hard, and great biography—and of such is the present case—requires a peculiarly laborious, appreciative, and interpretative texture of mind, which is at least as rare as are its subjects. Boswells are not commoner than Johnsons, nor Lockharts than Scotts. Yet few Arabists have been geniuses of this or of any other kind. Rückert stands alone among them as an independently creative mind, and not many of them have even shone in the interpretation of their own results.

It is easier, then, to state the elements in this problem than to solve it, easier to reckon and estimate the attempts than to follow in the adventure. But it is always something to reach light as to what the case demands, and it is still more to see clearly what has and has not been done. The way may thus be cleared to the success of the future.

Our necessity is to know what manner of man Muhammad was, and what was his life and his accomplishment. The environment into which he was born must be put before us, and that which he left—the effects of his work. When the term 'hero' is used of him, we would know what precisely that means, wherein his heroism lay, of soul, of courage, or of success. When he is called the Founder of a State, or simply a statesman, those terms, too, are obscure. To what extent and by what process and relation is historical Islam his handiwork? Was he a statesman of the type of Loyola, Luther, or Knox, Cromwell, Gustavus Adolphus or Charles II., Hildebrand, William the Conqueror or

Barbarossa? With all these he has undoubted traces of kinship. When he is called a Prophet, we must go still deeper. That word has a certain atmosphere for us, and is used commonly in a certain limited way. Was he such as Elijah, or Amos, or Isaiah? if so, which, and how? Or if his lips were not actually touched with the live coal of prophecy, was he a Seer, a man of visions who translated their contents into word and action? Again, if so, how are these to be psychologically explained? Was he a pathological subject, epileptic or cataleptic? Or was it a simple trance into which he passed, or a fit of ecstasy? Lastly, and above all, what was he as a man in himself, walking and talking among other men, as son, husband, father, friend? We would learn to know him in the details of his ordinary life, in his home and in the market-place, in the city and in the desert. Such is the task which fairly lies before the biographer of Muhammad.

And most varied are the results so far reached. We may pass by the time of simple ignorance, hatred and malice, in which Luther's is probably the greatest name and 'Sir John Mandeville' and the 'Golden Legend' the most picturesque, and perhaps not the most unfaithful, witnesses. To this period even Dean Prideaux's *Life* (1697) must be reckoned. A new path was entered by Gagnier of Oxford, who published in 1732 a *Life* which was based upon the Qur'an, the traditions of Muhammad's sayings and doings, and Arabic authorities in general. But George Sale had long been working in the same way at the original sources, and his translation of the Qur'an (1734), with a valuable introduction—including a life of Muhammad—and still more valuable commentary, remains to-day a useful book, after Gagnier's *Life* has been practically forgotten. It is true that Sale was much indebted to Maracci's Latin translation of the Qur'an with commentary (1698); but Maracci's work belongs to the Roman Arabic school, which stood so strangely apart from all others, and it had little immediate effect, while Sale's seems to have stirred a deep interest and been fruitful in many ways.

For more than a century the biography of Muhammad

remained fairly where Gagnier and Sale had left it. There were many compilations from their works, some real additions and much vain speculation, but the next actual step forward was made by Weil in 1834. In a very tightly packed little book of nearly five hundred pages, he went back to the MS. sources, built up from them a still unassailed historical outline, and, above all, used the Qur'an critically for the development of Muhammad's doctrine, working out for the first time in Europe a chronological arrangement of the fragments out of which it is composed. The same method of investigation was followed further and more faithfully by Nöldeke, in his *Geschichte des Qorans*, in 1860, with results which are still generally accepted. In 1863 appeared a short *Life* by the same scholar. The next two works in this development gave such abundance of detail, such weight and fulness of treatment, such keen appreciation of the psychological problem (as distinguished from the simple historical investigation), that, in spite of the many corrections now needed, they remain to this day the ripest full accounts of the life of Muhammad. Whatever may come in the future, they will remain classics of their subject, and monuments to the genius of their writers. They are the biographies by Sir William Muir (1861) and Aloys Sprenger (1861-65) respectively. Both owe their initiatives to lives spent in India; both saw and faced the problem of Muhammad's psychological condition; but their views were absolutely unlike on every other point. Sir William Muir (not 'Sir' then) had a healthy old-fashioned belief in the personality and working of the Evil One. Where evil was, there Satan was also. In consequence, it was possible for him to explain most logically the nature and products of the possession under which Muhammad suffered. Given his starting point, the situation was perfectly clear; he had an infinitely more thorough working hypothesis than any of his contemporaries who did not know what we know now of the phenomena of hypnosis and trance. Further, the stage reached by him in the investigation of the Muslim system of tradition was not passed until Goldziher put that study upon an

entirely new basis. Sprenger, on the other hand, not having a similar assurance as to the origin of evil, had to seek some other explanation. He had no patience with the Carlylean hero-hysterics—he knew the East too well—nor with vague talk about prophets. ‘In Germany,’ he says, ‘the word “prophet” is first robbed of all meaning, and then people say Muhammad was a “prophet.” If you were to do the same thing to the words “house” or “mountain,” you might say equally well that Muhammad was a “house” or a “mountain”’ (i. ix). Muhammad, for him, was a product of his time, and can be understood only in his time, when we see him as he stood among his contemporaries, the bearers of the spirit of his age. Along with this, Sprenger’s medical training enabled him to recognize in Muhammad what he called an hysterical subject, what we should now call a personality exhibiting trance phenomena of varying degrees of severity. Further, the extent of Sprenger’s reading in Arabic sources was enormous; his acuteness was marvellous; his archæological scholarship tended to eccentricity, and his philological to untrustworthiness. But, all in all, he has left a deeper personal mark on this investigation than anyone else.

Since Muir and Sprenger, very much has been done for details, but little of a broad, formative character. Short *Lives* have appeared from time to time: Krehl in 1884; Grimme in 1892; Buhl in 1903. The theology of the Qur’an has been studied to a certain extent (Grimme, 1895; Krehl, 1904; many scattered papers); but only enough to shew how much remains to be done. Goldziher, Wellhausen and Nöldeke have here produced much of the first value. Especially good and suggestive are the articles in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*’ (ninth ed.) vol. xv. pp. 545 ff. by Wellhausen on Muhammad, and by Nöldeke on the Qur’an. More recent and equally good is Wellhausen’s short introduction to his *Arabisches Reich und sein Sturz*.

But the most significant advance of late years has been in the mass of materials which has become accessible, and in the widening of the field of inquiry which has, in

consequence, been necessitated. Thus the historical sources have been traced steadily backwards until, while Gagnier was content to use as his foundation a fourteenth-century life of Muhammad, we have now in the magnificent edition of the *Class Book* of Ibn Sa'd, at present being produced under Sachau's care, a work of great extent belonging to the early ninth century, and within only a few links of traditionalists from Muhammad's immediate followers. A generation still earlier was Waqidi, of whom only one book has reached us, and more than half a century earlier yet Ibn Ishaq (*ob.* 150 of the Hijra = A.D. 767), whose life of Muhammad is so far our oldest source, though it unfortunately exists only in two incomplete re-edited forms.

Another kind of evidence which has also greatly increased of late is contained in the collections of traditions—short statements of sayings and doings of Muhammad, traced back to him by an authentic and trustworthy chain of traditionalists, each of whom repeats the precise words of his predecessor. Thus each tradition consists of two elements, the statement itself and the chain of authorities into whose ears and over whose lips it has passed. The number of these as handed down and accepted by Muslims is enormous, but only a small proportion can pass critical scrutiny. It is one of Goldziher's greatest merits that he has demonstrated that the mass of those traditions which have proved formative for Muslim theology or law must be rejected; they are almost certainly forgeries by later controversialists in support of their views. In this way it has come about that there are in existence, on every contested question, two flatly opposed sets of traditions. But while this holds in general, the student of the life and teachings of Muhammad must face the impossible task of mastering this chaotic jumble. Hidden in it are grains of gold, and each tradition has to be weighed by itself.

Again, new aids to the study of the Qur'an—well called 'the mind of Muhammad'—are crowding upon us in overwhelming abundance. With regard to them, as also to the collections of traditions, the Muhammadan East is doing excellently. The editors and publishers of India and

Egypt are vying with one another in enterprise and diligence. Books which were known to exist in MS., but which European scholars had long despaired of ever seeing in type on account of their size, the native presses of Egypt are gallantly attacking. The greatest credit and recognition should be rendered to them, and also to the wise and broad-minded policy of the English control, which in Egypt as in India has set itself to foster the intellectual life of the people at every point. Among no Muslim peoples are the printing-presses working to a tithe of the extent that is found in those under English rule. To this activity, then, we owe, for example, the great commentary on the Qur'an by Tabari, who died in 310 of the Hijra (A.D. 923). It is in thirty parts, binds up in seven large folio volumes, and forms the greatest of all the *thesauri* of early Muslim interpretation. Another is the equally extensive commentary of Razi (*ob.* A.H. 606 = A.D. 1208-9), an elaborate exposition in terms of mystical theology. Very many smaller books, too, have appeared on the history of the gradual revelation of the Qur'an—when and how such and such sections were delivered to Muhammad, &c. This critical analysis was carried out in the finest details by Muslim students long before Pentateuchal documents were dreamed of in Christendom.

But it is not only in Arabic books that our materials are accumulating. With every advance in our knowledge of the history of the Oriental Church in Syria, Arabia, Persia, and Abyssinia comes some further evidence for the antecedent conditions and early development of Islam. The early Christian heresies, the lives and practices of the Christian anchorites of Arabia, the struggle of Christianity in Yemen, all left their traces on Muhammad and his faith. The strange words and phrases of the Qur'an are gradually yielding their secrets and standing out in their true meanings, when confronted with the religious vocabulary and usages of Syriac, Rabbinic Hebrew, Sabeian, and Ethiopic. Ideas supposed original to Muhammad are, in the light of other literatures and largely through their appearance in inscriptions, now traced to their sources, and at last seen

in their application and range. Thus, only within the last few months, Professor Hubert Grimme has explained the 'amr of Allah in the Qur'an, commonly rendered 'command,' 'affair,' as essentially a Logos conception, and to be traced back to South Arabia in the Sabean and Minean inscriptions.¹

In these and many other ways, then, the materials for our understanding of the life and times of Muhammad have increased. But that does not mean that we are yet in a position to understand. There are great gaps even in the materials; what there is we have hardly read through yet, much less appreciated and digested. One great Arabist, who is supposed to read everything that appears in Arabic, is reported to have confessed that the Tabari commentary was too much for him; with it he could not keep up. Further, much work supposed over and done is now seen to have been very badly done and still to do. We, in England especially, were reckoned rich in translations of the Qur'an; between Sale, Rodwell, and Palmer, it was thought, the Qur'an was definitely known in English. But how far this is from fact is painfully evident to every careful student of Arabic. Sale deserved well of his time and used with diligence the materials he had. Rodwell applied a more precise knowledge of Arabic and a finer sense of literary form, and attacked the problem of the order in which the Qur'an sections were 'revealed.' Palmer used his wonderful mastery of Arabic as a speech and his knowledge of the desert life to reproduce the Qur'an in English with its realism, its dropping into slang and the colloquial, its broken contractions and vigorous usages; but he permitted, in his haste, such amazing errors to slip in that his version can be used only with the greatest circumspection. With regard to the enormous majority of these, not his scholarship but his care was at fault. His work was evidently done at headlong speed, and his ear was infinitely quicker and more exact than his eye. And this holds equally of the versions into other European languages. Only the translations which Sprenger scattered so liberally

¹ *Nöldeke-Festschrift*, i. pp. 452 ff.

through his life of Muhammad shew appreciation of the real problems in the case. Thus there does not exist in any language an adequate translation of the Qur'an; not even according to the judgement of the Arabic commentators. Yet such a labour—to take the sober, grammatical commentaries of, e.g., Baidawi and Zamakhshari, and to translate according to the meanings and constructions which they approve—stands well within our powers. But to cast aside these aids, and, in the light of our knowledge of Arabic and of Muhammad's times and environment, to translate at first hand for ourselves—that is a toil some day of necessity to be faced, but one which our knowledge does not yet justify us in attempting. Even a critical Arabic text of the Qur'an, on which to work, is still in the future. An excellent illustration of all this is an article by Professor A. Fischer of Leipzig which has just appeared in the *Nöldeke-Festschrift*, i. pp. 33 ff. In it he takes up Sura 101, 5-8; gives all the translations of that passage; shews their remarkable agreement in impossibility; goes on to give a crowd of passages from the Arabic commentators and lexicographers; shews their contradictions and generally fumbling treatment, and finally is driven to an ingenious conjecture of his own. Whether we accept that conjecture or not, the following points, at least, are made clear: (a) that in a passage of any difficulty none of the European translations can be trusted—they follow one another blindly; (b) that the Arabic commentators, beyond mere grammatical exegesis, cannot be absolutely followed; their traditional interpretation is based on conjectures and does not go back to Muhammad. To speak technically, the thread of the oral tradition of the Qur'an, between them and Muhammad, is as broken as that between the LXX. translators and the writers of the Old Testament. And (c) that for our final understanding of the Qur'an we must depend upon ourselves, upon our knowledge of Arabic and of Muhammad. To that knowledge, all these things, histories, collections of traditions, commentaries, collections of old poems and tales of the old Arabian life—the Arabic literature as a whole—must contribute. But we cannot be bound to

follow any tradition, or call any man master; in many ways it is already plain that we know more fully and see more clearly than any Muslim scholar. To sum up—such are the materials, and so great are the gaps; such our knowledge, and so much we have not yet made our own; such the task, and so far the accomplishment.

To the adventure now comes Professor Margoliouth. His book is not large, but in its 500 pages a full outline, if not a detailed account, is possible. His ample equipment as a scholar, too, is certain. He stands high among English Arabists, and has easy personal access to all the Arabic sources. Of the exactness of his renderings we may be assured, however we may question their interpretation once made. He will always observe that ultimate and absolute rule of agreement with his grammar—though he may not agree with anything or anyone else. For no one, taking up a new book by Professor Margoliouth, can forget that he has headed more forlorn hopes than perhaps any other English scholar of his rank now living, and, rightly or wrongly, has acquired the reputation of an individuality bordering on eccentricity. He certainly will not keep by the beaten way, and he may set off over the hedges. Further, his equipment goes far beyond Arabic. As has been suggested above, the interpretation of Muhammad's words must often be based on, or influenced by, the usage and ideas of Rabbinic Hebrew, the Aramaic dialects, Sabeian, and Ethiopic. The conceptions of the Synagogue and the Church in their widest geographical range and development must be reckoned with. In all this Professor Margoliouth is easily at home, and to a degree rare in an Arabist. Where both Sprenger and Muir broke down, and Krehl, Grimme and the rest went with faltering steps when they went at all, he can go safely. His recognition and use of the work of Continental scholars, too, is ample. From this English scholars have too often held aloof, but Professor Margoliouth takes his good where he can find it, and has studied diligently the fundamental discoveries of such men as Goldziher, Nöldeke, and Wellhausen. On another side he has widened the ordinarily

used sources. He recognizes the possible parallel between Muhammad and Joseph Smith, the founder of Mormonism, and also the distinctly mediumistic character of Muhammad's trances and utterances. He has therefore drawn into service Dr. I. W. Riley's *Psychological Study of Joseph Smith* and Mr. F. Podmore's *Modern Spiritualism*—a further development of the comparative and pathological method of Sprenger, but one not going far nor amounting practically to very much. We will return in detail later to this phase of Professor Margoliouth's method. But finally, why James P. Beckwourth's very dubious narrative of life with the Blackfoot Indians should be pressed into service to explain and illustrate the desert life of Muhammad's time is not clear. There are ample Arabian materials, both contemporary and, from the changelessness of the desert, as good as contemporary. Such are several narrations by present-day travellers, and especially the golden book of Doughty, here apparently unused. Nor is any comparison possible, in point of fundamental civilization and in spite of isolated points of usage, between any North American Indian tribe and the Arabs. If the Arabs often exhibited barbaric traits, they were also an eminently civilizable race, and, time and again, had advanced far into civilization. But of this more hereafter.

After introductory notes on transliteration, chronology, geography, and bibliography, Professor Margoliouth deals with his subject in thirteen chapters. He wisely eschews dates, and especially chronological tables; but the following chapter-headings are suggestive of the sequence he adopts: 'The birthplace of the hero; early life of Mohammed; Islam as a secret society; publicity; history of the Meccan period; the migration; the battle of Badr; progress and a setback; the destruction of the Jews; steps towards the taking of Meccah; the taking of Meccah; the settlement of Arabia; the last year.' In the order of these rubrics there is no element of novelty, but it is noteworthy that they all suggest external events and political history. Nothing in them would give an idea that they referred to a professed prophet, and dealt with what was primarily a religious movement. 'A secret

society' is the term thought fitting for the little band of believers who accepted Muhammad as God's messenger and his doctrine of God as the truth, and 'the settlement of Arabia' describes how the tribes came into Medina and swore faith and fealty to the Apostle. And such explicitly is Professor Margoliouth's attitude and conception. In his preface (p. vi) he says, 'I regard Mohammed as a great man, who solved a political problem of appalling difficulty, —the construction of a state and an empire out of the Arab tribes.' This, of course, is a perfectly defensible position; but it needs defending. It brings the book perilously near the class of cynical eighteenth-century histories, revelling in statecraft and priestcraft, and takes it away from the broadly human and sympathetic conceptions which have grown up within the last fifty years. Such, however, is the attitude and method of the book throughout. The success of Muhammad was due to his unerring knowledge of men and general political foresight. He was the astutest of statesmen, we are told. The parallels between him and a trickish medium are pressed at every turn. His enthusiasm was a mask (p. 79), and under it was the soundest and sanest common-sense. It was a part which he played with a patience, resolution, and ingenuity which made it a success (p. 80). Trickery is suggested from the earliest time; his occasional access to the 'Preserved Tablet' is his way of managing so that he can legislate as occasion demands (p. 91), and is much better than Joseph Smith's idea; a 'brilliant answer' to his wife Khadija secures her devotion (p. 93). He dresses and behaves in such a way as to suit the part he is playing (p. 105). Of this kind much the same things are suggested of him to secure and retain his adherents as were alleged of John Henry Newman when still in the Anglican Church. 'Like most of those who have known mankind thoroughly, Mohammed held, and at times all but openly avowed, the doctrine that every man has his price, and indeed a price to be estimated in camels' (p. 113). This is said of his early Meccan period. On pp. 112 ff. the story of his lapse is told, the concession which he made to Al-Lat

and Al-'Uzza. It is represented as a scheme on the part of Muhammad—who was not so fiery a monotheist and anti-idolater after all (p. 79)—to secure the adhesion of the Meccans. It broke down because his followers were more sincere than he himself; he had made enthusiasts and now could not control them. His will, therefore, had to bend, and he had to resign himself to declare that he had made a mistake. The conflict was not within Muhammad's soul, but between him and his followers. He had a destination to which he was steering, and towards that he piloted himself with skill (p. 82).

So objectively we may state Professor Margoliouth's view of the character of Muhammad, by far the principal matter in any *Life* of him. Further consideration may be better put in the form of direct criticism; for, unfortunately, we are fundamentally at odds with Professor Margoliouth, both as to the earlier and the later stages of Muhammad's development. To the earlier he is much less than just, and in the later there is a tendency to gloss over facts that shew the lower depths of Muhammad's nature, which affected the whole system of Islam, and which have been the great clog on the progress of the Muslim peoples.

The first great point on which issue must be taken is the condition of Arabia when Muhammad appeared upon the scene. As that is put before us here, Muhammad's entrance is absolutely unconditioned; he is not a product of his age in any respect; given even his personality, there was no soil on which he could work, there were no men whom he could affect. The great facts of his own personality and of the resultant Islam are inexplicable. Of course, if we presuppose that he was a Titanic, demoniac force—of the devil, with Sir William Muir; of the world-spirit, with Carlyle—the situation and the results become more possible. But that is not the conception here. Muhammad, for our present authority, was a keen scheming politician, who must often have been surprised at the tremendous effects which he produced on the souls of men. Even if we take Sprenger's anti-heroic conception and regard him as a strict product

of his age, the question at once arises, 'What kind of age must that have been?' And to that question no answer is given here. The description of contemporary Arabia is bald, trivial, unproportioned, inadequate. The great movements are either unrecognized or distorted or belittled. In justification of this criticism it is hard to find a special passage to quote, for what we have is a tone running through the whole. But the following sentence, descriptive of the European Middle Ages, will be amply sufficient to shew what passes with Professor Margoliouth for historic sense: 'Just so, in the Middle Ages, the Christian life consisted in the institution of feudalism, with knights in armour clad, fighting each other, and the blood-feud was the most important of existing institutions; but a certain class of the population kept out of the fighting and lived in quiet—the monks and nuns' (p. 40). Precisely as one-sided and unilluminative are the descriptions of the life of Arabia.

The truth is that Muhammad was, in a singular degree, the child of his time, and his time was a very extraordinary one. Arabia had been passing through a renaissance. Up to his immediate period the form of this renaissance seems to have been mainly literary—that is, poetical. The Arabian peninsula appears always to have produced poetry of a certain very definite kind, and still produces it; but the only great outburst of real poetic energy and beauty of which we know is that towards the close of which Muhammad came. Of this outburst he was a product, and with another temperament and under other personal conditions he would have been another of the classical Arabian poets. As it is, there is no shadow of recognition in this book that one of the great poetical blossoming-times of the world immediately preceded him. Imr-al-Qais is mentioned, but as an outlaw, only incidentally as a poet (p. 65); Zuhayr is quoted, but for a maxim from the worldly prudence of the ambitious (p. 78); Hatim of Tay is a raider, not a poet whose songs are still read. The parallel again and again suggested for the life of Arabia is that of the Blackfoot Indians, unlettered, uninspired, falling as the autumn leaves without record or trace, savage in every

sense, rather than of a people, savage in the way of many a Greek clan, but leaving behind it great traditions and ideals and a body of mighty verse, polished and elaborate in structure as any in Greek, instinct with intense life and blossoming in images and ideas which still grasp and control us. It is verse with a narrow range ; but within that range there is smoothness and strength, intoxication and simplicity, the ringing music of the ballad and the elaborate artifice of the epigram, joined as we find them nowhere else. And of all that there is no hint here. Frankly, the attitude of Professor Margoliouth in regard to this is unintelligible, and it leaves Muhammad and his movement unintelligible too.

Again, it is very clear that the fermenting unrest of Arabia was not æsthetic only, and did not limit itself to seeking and producing the beautiful. There was a hungering after righteousness and a vain search for some answer to the riddle of life. Arabian poets echo the sad accents of Ecclesiastes, but with a fiery vehemence unlike his enforced tranquillity. Their poetry was not a mere literary product, but expressed their life, and was a criticism of it. Even through their songs of women and wine, of the glory of living and the joy of battle, there runs a burden of brooding melancholy for the days and the lives gone by. The snows of yester-year lie heavy even on those torrid verses. The mountains abide and the stars wheel past on their everlasting circlings, but the race of mankind returns not when the earth has once gathered him to itself. So while some sang of the present and lived for it, others turned to the mystery and sought to wrest from it its secret. These were the Seekers, and they tried many faiths, of this kind and that, Christianity in many forms, Judaism, Zoroastrianism, or some combination and simplification of them all ; only the unreasoned faith of their fathers they could no longer hold ; the old household gods, whatever memories went with them, they could no longer worship. Some reality they must reach and some duty they must know and do. Of these, without question, was Muhammad ; their burden, the evil and darkness of the world, was heavy upon him

before the Voices began to speak to him. He was in very real travail of his soul, and the thought of a wrath to come had stuck close to him. The reality of the Judgement was one of his earliest fixed ideas. Two things especially had brought it home to him, as to so many of his fellows—the Christian hermits seeking the salvation of their souls in the desert solitudes, and the rock tombs with the remains therein along the caravan routes, which he took to be relics of forgotten tribes, judged and destroyed by God. This, too, is minimized by Professor Margoliouth, who takes thereby all seriousness from the figure of Muhammad in order to display him as an astute politician. But with it vanishes also the explanation of Muhammad's success in winning and holding men, and of the earnestness which lay in the earliest Muslim State and which carried it out on its career of conquest.

The second point of issue is precisely this matter of the personality of Muhammad himself. Is Professor Margoliouth's statement adequate? Or must we, to explain his life and its results, look for something more in him than astute statesmanship? On one side has the word 'prophet' any meaning as applied to him; and, on another, how can we think of him as a literary artist? His Qur'an is undoubtedly a very considerable piece of literature. We may not, like the Muslims, think of it as an unapproachable model of style, but we must admit that it is a book to be reckoned with. Professor Margoliouth reduces the prophethood to a bundle of mediumistic tricks, and the Qur'an he, to all intents and purposes, ignores. But how stand the facts?

First, it is perfectly clear that Muhammad, both as to inspiration, if we call it so, and as to the form of his literary art, belonged to the well-defined class of *Kahins* or soothsayers. That has been assured by Goldziher's article on *Hija'* poetry, in his *Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie*, i. pp. 1-105, published ten years ago. There we learned that soothsayers, and those generally who were supposed to be speaking under the influence of spiritual powers, passed into a trance or ecstasy and cast their utterances into

rhymed prose. On the other hand, rhymed prose was not used except by speakers under such spiritual influences; the ordinary forms of oratory in the olden times were free from rhyme. But the Qur'an throughout is in rhymed prose, and the tradition is constant that his 'revelations' came to Muhammad when in a cataleptic seizure or trance. This second element Professor Margoliouth has rightly recognized as connecting him with the medium class, about which, thanks to the labours of the Society for Psychical Research, we now know so much more than did even Sprenger; but most curiously, in spite of knowledge of Goldziher's *Abhandlung* (p. xxv), he speaks of rhymed prose as though it were the ordinary form of oratory and had no specific connection with the Kahins or soothsayers (p. 88). When we add further that it was precisely this form of utterance which laid Muhammad open to the charge that he was only a Kahin—the most grievous charge, to him, that his opponents ever brought forward—it will be plain that his adoption of it could hardly have been voluntary, and that he continued to use it only because he had, without his own will, been thoroughly committed to it. The truth is that he *was* a Kahin, with whatever kind of 'inspiration' that involved. In his early days, when in terror for his soul and fleeing from the wrath to come, his 'conversion' was worked most sincerely by visions and voices, and in that spiritual stress he fell naturally into the usages and forms of speech which contact with the invisible world demanded in his time. The vocabulary used to denote his 'possession,' 'inspiration,' the angel visitors and guides which came to him, &c., is the same as that used of the soothsayers. A very curious and apparently quite genuine series of traditions deals with a Jewish boy of Medina, named Ibn Sayyad, who exhibited precisely the external phenomena of Muhammad, and who, in consequence, was 'investigated' by him, much after the fashion of the Society for Psychical Research. The matter interested him, but he could get no final light upon it, and finally let the boy alone. This whole story is very curious and calls for detailed examination. It

makes certain the existence of parallel phenomena to those of Muhammad, and that there was no external difference between him and the Kahins (*cf.* Bukhari's *Sahih*, 'Book of Adab,' viii. 40; *Masabih*, ii. 140; and *Aghani*, xix. 25). That Muhammad was not genuinely honest with himself and others in this earliest period is unthinkable. The lasting effects which he produced, the minds which he reached and changed, the religion which he founded cry out against any other view. 'An unbelieving Pope will never do'; much less an unbelieving 'prophet,' however we define that word. In his later life the case was very different. Making all the allowances we please for self-deception—and this, it is becoming increasingly clear, is fatally easy in such pathological cases—we cannot escape the assurance that the awful machinery of divine inspiration was then forged and falsified for his own selfish and ignoble purposes. *Nemo repente fuit turpissimus*; it took Muhammad some twenty years.

Secondly, it is equally clear that Muhammad, in his earlier life, was animated by a genuine reforming impulse, and that, throughout all his life, he believed that the Muslim laws of faith and conduct were for the salvation and great advantage of the Arab race. The early chapters of the Qur'an are full of exhortations to justice and charity towards the wayfarer, and the bondsman, and kindred. Muhammad himself had felt the misery of the orphan and the poor, and he alternates descriptions of the terrors of hell with exhortations to the covetous and tyrannical rich. This is his point of contact with the Old Testament prophet, so far as it goes. The fire never burns as smokeless and free from self as in Amos, but the fire is there. To ignore or minimize this sense of moral responsibility, as is done here, is to leave an enormous gap in Muhammad's character, and to render still less intelligible his results.

Thirdly, Muhammad's leaning towards devotional exercises and ascetic practices in general must be taken into the reckoning. In his earlier life he was actuated by genuine piety; Allah and his own relationship to Him were very real. And all his life the peril of his soul was

in his mind. Long night devotions, therefore, appealed to him; fastings also, but all under strict common sense. Nöldeke has suggested how near to founding a monkish community Muhammad came; and Sachau, in the preface to Ibn Sa'd (iii. I. vi.), calls Medina for a quarter-century after Muhammad's death 'der machtvolle Centralsitz eines mönchischen Imperiums.' Some of his followers tried to push these things too far, and he rebuked them. His body was not to him, as to St. Francis, Brother Ass, but had its own rights. Yet that he knew what a prayerful walk with God meant, and fostered it by suitable exercises, is certain. That this went together, in his later life, with dark selfishness and unholy thoughts is only part of the problem of emotional psychology. It must be added into our estimate; Muhammad's was no simple mind.

And fourthly—and most important, perhaps, of all—the weightiest source for Muhammad's life is the Qur'an. Every student of early Islam has used it—Sprenger above all others—and the success of the investigation of each has been proportioned to the depth of his use. Yet Professor Margoliouth seems to have used it less than he did any other. References to it, when they occur, are sometimes left vague (p. 424); the important *Rahman* passages have only one mention, and that most obscure (p. 143). To the essential problem of the arrangement of the Qur'an, and (dependent thereon) Muhammad's psychical development, no attention is given. Quotations from it are inserted only 'in the rarest cases' (p. vi). This is to save space, but a few chosen on almost any principle would have sent Professor Margoliouth's hypothesis to the winds. Only in the Medinan period, when it was used for political purposes, and came, as Sprenger expressed it, to consist of 'leading articles,' do we find many references to it (pp. 217, 250, 275, &c.). The result, of course, is that the spiritual side of Muhammad's ideas and life is left in the background or out of sight altogether. An essentially worldly attitude and tone can be maintained. It is possible to speak of 'the clear-headed man who played the part of Prophet' (p. 124) and of 'brazen-faced assertion

and assurance' (p. 138). But how anyone could study the early half of the Qur'an and then so construct the character of Muhammad passes our comprehension.

On these four counts, then, we find this reading of Muhammad most inadequate and misleading. He was a lineal descendant of the Arabian soothsayers, and stood, thus, in some relationship to the forms of Old Testament prophecy—to that broad soil out of and above which the Old Testament prophets towered so high. He was actuated, in his earlier work at least, by a great moral indignation and reforming energy. He was a man of piety and devotion, and was given to religious and ascetic exercises. He left behind him a book full of utterances corresponding to the above, and breathing in its earlier portion a sincere spirit. Such a man was not simply an astute statesman, whatever other term we may find it necessary to apply to him; nor did he wear a mask, or play a part, or use brazen-faced assurance.

But was he a statesman at all? Did he really found the Muslim State? All the signs are that he was not and did not, just as he was not a great soldier. He had a fair knowledge of men, but his practical sagacity was often at fault and got him again and again into trouble. He had a personal power of making men believe in him, trust him, love him; he was able to affect their hearts and lives, and to transform them into imitations of himself; he was able to give them some fundamental conceptions of God and the world, and the Judgement, and things to come; he was able to inspire them with a high courage and trust in their destiny; he was able, in a word, to furnish the spiritual essentials on which the Muslim State was based; but the Muslim State itself was not his work. That fell to his successors, Abu Bakr and 'Umar, and they did it well. No statesman could have done his part; could have given the spirit and the life which have kept Islam strong for almost fourteen centuries. After him there came the great Muslim outburst, when the Arab armies raided, within a century, from Samarcand to Tours. And therein lies the great problem of Islam. When we pass from the futile skirmish-

ings and childish generalship of both Meccans and Muslims at Badr and Uhud to find the armies of victorious Arabia crushing Persia and Byzantium, and, led by great soldiers and followed by able administrators and legislators, touching the limits of the known world—with blood and steel reaching China—and founding the glorious, if brief, united Muslim Empire, we are driven to admit that some great change must have come, some new spirit been invoked. The Arab people must have been ready for all this and only needing a touch, and that touch could not have been given by any self-seeking impostor with insincerity in his heart and time-serving on his lips. Whatever we think of Muhammad, he must have been *real*.

Such is the fundamental criticism which we must bring against this book. Others will be of details, though of some importance. The theorizing, subjectively reconstructing method which prevails, from the first page onward, is unfortunate. On that first page we learn that to have conducted a caravan safely must have required certain qualities; Muhammad had done so; therefore he had these qualities. Thereafter the whole book is constructed on the hypothesis of the said qualities. Similarly, pp. 77, 79, 82, 113, 141, 172, and many other passages. Contrasting negatively with this is a curious and apparently perfectly unwarranted doubt as to Muhammad's knowledge of the Meccan religion (p. 141). If he did not know, who did? It is perfectly true that the historical evidence is sometimes of the most puzzling description, raising large doubts as to its general value (p. 419), but this makes the strict suppression of subjectivity all the more necessary. In the discordant mass of evidence a basis could be found for almost any hypothesis.

Another unfortunate characteristic of the book is its consistent lightness of language. There is certainly much told in it that calls for reprehension—if such be ever in place in history, but it should be with dignity and not with a trivial sneer. What, too, is meant by saying that Muhammad's 'having learned to read by miracle' may have been suggested by the similar miracle of Jesus of

Nazareth' (p. 91) we cannot divine; the taste exhibited in the remark is, at any rate, poor. Worse is the comparison (p. 352) between Abu Huraira and the author of the Fourth Gospel—on any hypothesis of authorship. Those who know most of Abu Huraira will understand this best.

On p. vii Professor Margoliouth expresses the hope that his book will be found absolutely free from endeavour to shew the superiority or inferiority of Muhammad's religion to any other. It may be doubted how far the avoidance of such comparison, explicitly or implicitly, is possible, if the religion, whatever it may be, is to be clearly presented. Direct polemics need not, of course, be entered upon; but it will hardly be possible for any writer to make his statements clear, and leave his own feeling unexpressed. So it is not surprising that on pp. 460 f. distinct comparison occurs in stating the working out of Muhammad's system with regard to women. It is, however, surprising to learn that for women he accomplished much and could not have accomplished more—so we understand the passage; that polygamy is to be set off against prostitution—which, it is thus suggested, does not exist in Islam; and that, though wife-beating is recommended in the Qur'an, women should balance against this the fact that the Prophet is said to have forbidden their being beaten on the face. On pp. 176 f. we have also the usual defence of Muhammad's numerous marriages—desire for a son, desire to bind his followers to him, &c. It may not, therefore, be out of place here to look briefly at the effect of Muhammad's conduct and doctrine as to this matter on Islam.

The case is put in a nutshell if we consider what would have been the difference if Muhammad had continued a monogamist after Khadija's death as he was before it. He need have done no more; stated no laws on the subject, but simply left his own example to work itself out. It would have been enough. As his example has been studied minutely and followed scrupulously at all points, even the slightest, by all believing Muslims, so, in the end, monogamy would have triumphed. And similarly it would have gone with the veil. If he had subdued his jealousy

and let his wife go with uncovered face, as a woman of the free desert still goes, the freedom of the desert would have held its own against the suspicions of the town. As it is, all Muslims must believe that their prophet had larger sexual privileges than they themselves, and those of them who are struggling at present for the advancement of Islam are driven to assert that the veil was meant to apply only to the wives of the Prophet.¹ As the end shewed, all Muhammad's politic views in multiplying his wives—if such views he had—came to nothing, and those wives became rather elements of disruption in the civil war which shattered the Muslim State.

But the truth is that the fault lay in Muhammad's own nature. Whether he suffered from a disease which became his master, as Sprenger, not without ground, imagined (i. 209), we cannot be assured. That he was lustful to the highest degree is certain; also that he made no effort to curb his lust. The Muslim writers treat this quite simply and unaffectedly; they never felt any need of explaining in a politic manner his much marrying. The tales, rather, which they tell of their prophet's life in this respect cannot be reproduced here. His immediate contemporaries had been somewhat scandalized; their conceptions of prophets were Jewish and Christian. But later Islam readjusted itself, and a curious scheme of asceticism was built up in which subjugation of the sexual appetite was completely dropped. Their prophet had not recognized anything of the kind. Therefore, though the ordinary Muslim is restricted to four wives, his religion, in this case the example of Muhammad, does not limit him in any other respect. The singular results of this it is hard, or rather impossible, to describe with decency. It produced a certain attitude of mind which, in its turn, reacted on both conduct and language. In respect of language it led, at the least, to an extraordinary depravity of taste. Thus al-Ghazzali, for example (*ob.* 505 of the Hijra=A.D. 1111), probably the greatest Muslim theologian and a man of a singularly spiritual mind, gives two reasons for the implanting of the sexual impulse: first, that man

¹ César Benatter, *L'Esprit libéral du Coran* (Paris, 1905), p. 14 ff.

should have some analogy for the joys of heaven; and second, the continuance of the race. (*Ihya*, vol. vii., p. 428 of the Cairo edit. with commentary of the Sayyid Murtada.) Other examples, which it is impossible to enter upon further, dealing with the conduct of sexual intercourse, occur in the same work—vol. v., p. 371 ff., and with the joys of Paradise, in vol. x., p. 542 ff. The very extensive commentary of the Sayyid Murtada is also of importance; it was finished A.H. 1201=A.D. 1787. All these are full of traditions handed down from Muhammad. If we turn, then, to the formal collections of such traditions we find the same thing. Again details are impossible, but a sufficient example is the story of the wretched women captured on the raid against the Banu Mustaliq, where we read how the Muslims, with the presence and approval of Muhammad, strained at a most abominable gnat over them. (Al-Bukhari's *Sahih*, edit. of Cairo, 1314, v. 115 and vii. 33.) The historic truth of the occurrence is not here the point, but that this tradition about it was handed down and taught as a ruling by the Prophet. Of Muhammad's own conduct there is a suggestion in the same work, vii. 34. All this could be multiplied indefinitely, and for all this Muhammad is personally responsible. The Arabs, certainly, as a race have always been sexually inclined, but the enormous development of that passion in Islam, its being made a normal and prominent subject of thought and speech, and its being excluded from the ascetic scheme are due to his example.

The general public among ourselves has, of late, become aware of the existence in Arabic of a special department of literature dealing with sexual matters. Without doubt, this is due principally to the controversy over Sir Richard Burton's translation of the 'Scented Garden' of an-Nafzawi. That such books exist in considerable numbers is true, and also that they form a perfectly regular and accepted part of Muslim literature. But it must not be supposed that it is only in such books that such subjects are discussed. The examples given above—and they could easily be enlarged—will shew that the same occur in grave treatises

on theology. The topic is simply normal ; only some books are devoted to it alone. It is, therefore, unfortunately true that anyone who wishes really to know the Muslim East must have some acquaintance with that branch of its literature. It will be for him to see to it in what spirit he studies. The study itself is necessary, for, while it is perfectly possible to know Christendom and its civilization very satisfactorily and yet have no acquaintance with the books which the booksellers call 'curious,' that is not possible in Islam. We have dealt with the subject in these pages with extreme reluctance ; but in view of the attitude which is not infrequently adopted at the present day, and the language which is used, with regard to Muhammadanism in conjunction with other religions of the East it seemed to us impossible that it should either be omitted or slurred over. These books and their ideas are an integral part of the Muslim civilization. Further, the basis of many of them is to be found in Indian literature. But if the translation by Dr. Richard Schmidt of the 'Kamasutram' of Vatsyayana gives at all a fair idea of the Indian type, the Muslims have gone far beyond their instructors in simple fleshliness. There, too, is Muhammad's work. In a word, the thought of women and the attitude of men towards them were placed by him on an openly sexual and sensual basis.

It is with deep regret that we make this extended criticism of the work of such a scholar as Professor Margoliouth. But we are compelled to regard his interpretation of Muhammad as a failure throughout. Too much and too little is made of him. He was not as clever a man as Professor Margoliouth would have him, but he was much greater. His nature was not so simple as that of the Muhammad here ; there was in it far more both of good and of evil.

ART. VII.—LIBERAL THEOLOGY, III.

1. *Exploratio Evangelica*. A Brief Examination of the Basis and Origin of Christian Belief. By PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D. (London : A. & C. Black, 1899.)
2. *Contentio Veritatis*. Essays in Constructive Theology. By SIX OXFORD TUTORS. (London : Murray, 1902.)
3. *The Ritschlian Theology, Critical and Constructive*. An Exposition and an Estimate. By A. E. GARVIE, M.A., B.D. Second Edition. (Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark, 1902.)
4. *The Virgin Birth of Christ*. By P. LOBSTEIN. With an Introduction by W. D. MORRISON, LL.D. (London : Williams & Norgate, 1903.)
5. *Christus in Ecclesia*. By HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.Litt. (Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark, 1904.)

XI.

As we have already seen, the principle of the continuity of history means this—that, in every field of human activity, man acts and reacts according to the essential laws and powers of his own nature. If, then, this principle be true, man's religious history cannot be a thing apart—or, more accurately, cannot be a thing *entirely* apart, quite dissimilar from the history of his secular endeavour and experience, nor can Christian history be quite dissimilar from other religious history. Although divine factors which are not elsewhere present make Christian history unique, we shall, if we believe the principle of continuity to be true, expect that it will be marked by phenomena similar to those which characterize the history of other religions—that there will be, in fact, a certain community of character between Christian and non-Christian history. Whatever the extent of this community, to that extent Christian history will fall into line with the histories of other religions, and may properly be regarded as part of the general religious history of the race.

This community of character, however, will subsist only in certain groups of phenomena which illustrate the universal presence of certain psychological laws and agencies, and will warrant no inference more important than this—that in all religious history human nature is similarly active. This inference is the ground—or, at least, an important part of the ground—upon which modern thought attempts to construct a science of Comparative Religions.

It would be beside our present purpose to enter upon any detailed examination of this attempt. We need only emphasize one necessary warning. Because the psychological agencies in Christian history are generically identical with those creative in other religious histories, Christianity falls into line, to some extent, with other religions. But it does not thereby become co-ordinate with them, or cease to be unique. The common character which results from the constructive activity of common psychical agencies is a phenomenal character—*only* a phenomenal character. Whatever be the case with other religions, in Christianity this phenomenal character is of only secondary importance. *Our* faith, if no other, has its foundation, not in the imaginative heart and speculative mind of man, but in the efficacious will of God. *Fundamenta ejus in montibus sanctis*. In the temporal superstructure of the *Civitas Dei* are many things of human origin, but the foundations of the city are divine. Christianity is what it is, not because ethnic practices and beliefs have been 'baptized into Christ'—not because the creative spirit of man has, within the Christian fellowship, enshrined its hope and thought in forms like unto those which it has elsewhere made instrumental to its faith; but because 'the Word became flesh' and, as thus incarnate, is, from age to age, the living centre of a new allegiance, the imperishable ground of a new trust. Because Christianity is founded upon this Divine Act, it is unique among the religions of the world—not *primus inter pares*, but something of a different kind. It is in certain ways similar to other faiths, because it ministers to the same universal needs and appeals to the same primary potency of human nature, and because,

also, its history is marked by kindred beliefs and practices. But the similarity thus constituted is only functional and phenomenal—sufficient to make a science of Comparative Religions possible, not sufficient to co-ordinate Christianity with other faiths.

The Christian religion is essentially divine, for it is founded upon the Incarnation, and is maintained, as we believe, by the perpetual operation of the Holy Spirit. But the religion thus founded has become part of human history, and the divine activities which constantly renew its youth are operative within the hearts and minds of men who, in the essential constitution of their several natures, are in no important way different from their fellows. Because the Love which sustains the Church is rational, and because the ends which that Love seeks can be realized only in and by *persons*—in and by the edification of personal lives into 'the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ'—it seems reasonable to expect that the operations of that Love will not supersede the characteristic activities of human nature, but will leave that nature free to respond to the visitation of God according to the characteristic laws of its own personal life. A nature that is essentially personal cannot be 'saved' by destroying its personality; nor can we think that God would seek to realize an ideal which is a catholic ideal for *persons* by using persons as mere instruments.

The question is sometimes asked—Do we know enough concerning the purpose of God to use that purpose constructively? It is undoubtedly true that the essence of God is inscrutable; true, also, that His thoughts are higher than our thoughts, and His ways higher than our ways. We worship 'the Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, the Holy Ghost incomprehensible,' but we must be careful not to exaggerate or misinterpret the 'immensity' before which we bow. The substantial essence of the Divine Life is unknown, and cannot be explored by the human reason or pictured by the human imagination. God, we say, is *causa sui*, but the phrase is really a negation, and does little more than cover an

incompetence of thought. We cannot form any clear conception of Self-existent Being, or of a nature which, because it is the ground of Time and Space, is unconditioned by Time and Space.

Although, however, the *nature* of God is inscrutable, His *character* is not unintelligible. The world is not the accidental result of random Power. It is the purposed creation of Thought, the ordered resultant of a rational will; and the Christian revelation declares that Rational Will to be Righteous Love. Now, Rationality, Righteousness, and Love are not unintelligible. The Divine Essence is incomprehensible, but we know what Love is, and we can understand its workings. The revelation that declares God to be Love declares also that, in so far as He is Love, His character is intelligible. As with Love, so with Thought. It were merely playing with words to attribute a rational nature to God, if we believed His nature to be unintelligible; for an unintelligible nature cannot be rational. Nor can we find relief by saying that God is hyper-rational, for the hyper-rational, no less than the irrational, is unintelligible—something other than the rational. In this connection *ὁππερ* means 'not.' Undoubtedly the attributes of God are perfect, whereas the homologous attributes of man are imperfect; but, perfect or imperfect, Love is always Love and Reason always Reason. Neither Love nor Reason change their nature and pass into something else when they become complete. The intellectual and moral attributes of God, then, do not share in the 'immensity' of the Divine Essence. Did they do so, His immensity would be no less oppressive than those physical magnitudes which sometimes seem overwhelming. We can derive no support against the immensity of Nature from a similar Divine immensity. 'God is our refuge' because His character, being what revelation declares it to be, is an intelligible character.

Because the character of God is thus intelligible, we may properly infer His method from His purpose. If that purpose be—as we believe it to be—one which can be realized only in and by persons, we cannot suppose that

the ministry of grace which is ancillary to that purpose will override the personality of man, and use man as a mere vehicle or instrument. We conclude, therefore, that even within the field of the divine operations, and when subject to the visitation of God, man will still act and react, not as though he were an impersonal tool, but according to the characteristic laws and powers of his nature, which is essentially a personal nature.

If this conclusion be correct, we shall expect to find that along the line of Christian history the human spirit has been constructive of beliefs and practices similar to those which mark other lines of religious tradition. And this expectation, if entertained, would not be misleading. Outside Christendom the creative spirit of man has been variously constructive of belief and observance. Within Christendom that same spirit—quickened, and not suppressed, by divine influence—has been similarly constructive. There is, as a consequence, a wide range of phenomenal resemblance between Christian and non-Christian history. In both, for instance, we find myths and legends that purport to be and are not veridical, miracles that were not miracles, pretended prophecies in which there was nothing divine.

That the secular tradition of the Christian Faith has been marked by secondary constructions of this kind is one of the plainest facts of ecclesiastical history. 'We have this treasure in earthen vessels,' and the vessels are not mere vessels, but have activities of their own which are not suppressed nor completely controlled by the divine influx.

XII.

Probably no one would protest against a recognition of these secondary constructions in the history which is ordinarily called ecclesiastical; but many are reluctant to admit that such constructions exist in those early documentary sources which Christians of every denomination regard as primary. The Bible, they think, is a thing apart—a divine gift, not a human work—a Sacred Book, it is true,

but one unlike other Sacred Books, a Book comparable with others only as a contrast.

This reluctance is intelligible in those who believe that God has purposed to accomplish the salvation of men by means of the written Word; who think that 'the Bible and the Bible only' is the true religion for all Christian men; but those of us who are not constrained by this mistake need not share the consequent hesitation.

The primary instrument of salvation is not a book but the Christian Society—the Catholic Church, with its secular tradition of revealed truth and mediating ministry of grace. The practical basis of our faith is not diplomatic but experimental. We are Catholic Christians because of an experience which has its ground and explanation in the fellowship and testimony of the Catholic Church. Therefore we are under no constraint towards Bibliolatry. We receive the Christian Scriptures as witnesses to the Church's earliest and formative faith and to the divine facts which are essential for Christian history. The older Scriptures we receive as witnessing to an earlier discipline and revelation whereby the way was in fact prepared for the 'full, perfect, and sufficient' revelation made 'once for all' by the Incarnation of the Word, and for the evangelical mission of the Church. We have, however, no reason for supposing those Scriptures to be *wholly* divine—completely free from those human constructions we have called secondary. Whether they do, in fact, contain such constructions is a literary and historical question which can be finally answered only by a sufficiently informed and sufficiently equipped criticism.

It must be made perfectly clear that we have no quarrel with Criticism *as such*. We may reasonably think that its actual methods are sometimes inadequate, we may reasonably reject some of its conclusions, but we may not be merely antagonistic, nor may we seek to shelter ourselves behind theological authority: indeed, no sufficient authority of that kind exists. If we are called upon to be combatants we must meet Criticism upon its own ground, and must establish our case by superior science—by more adequate

learning and by a better method. Certainly—most certainly—we may not for one moment ally ourselves with the ignorant effrontery of Dr. Emil Reich.

XIII.

The third conception which Christian theology is invited to accept as regulative is the conception of development. The world, we are told, is not static but dynamic, and the world-process is continuous, so that all 'facts' are 'events,' and all 'events' are generated.¹

(a) The idea of development has become most widely familiar through the biological doctrine of Evolution. Many years ago, when Darwin's work was still novel, the foremost bishop of the day fulminated against it, and since that time the thunders, although diminishing, have been continuous.

Now, the theory of biological development may be held in one or other of three forms :

1. As a doctrine which attributes to infra-human forms of life a natural genesis from earlier forms.
2. As a doctrine which extends this attribution to the human body.
3. As a doctrine which derives man himself, in the full actuality of his nature, from non-human forms of life.

We say at once that, in so far as this doctrine is a doctrine of genetic connection, no theological objection can be sustained against it. Even if it were true that human nature is the result of some natural process of 'becoming,' no part of the Catholic Faith would be endangered. At the very most this discovery would compel us to revise only certain opinions which, although widely received, are not now universal, are not necessary, are not authoritative.

¹ 'Generated,' because the doctrine of development, as ordinarily stated, implies that one thing (or event) comes out of another. 'Generation' is narrower than 'causation,' because the latter does not always and necessarily imply genesis in a natural order of 'becoming.'

With biology, pure and simple, Christian theology has no immediate concern. For theologians the question 'How have existent animal forms come into being?' is little more than curious. On the other hand, if we take anthropology in its widest meaning—as an endeavour towards a complete doctrine of human nature—then, undoubtedly, in that branch of inquiry theology has an interest which is direct and important. Christianity presupposes that human nature is essentially spiritual. Therefore, Christian theology cannot be indifferent to the secular inquiries of anthropology.¹ Its interest, however, is strictly limited. It is not concerned to deny that human nature is derivative, provided only that whatever derivation is suggested be consistent with the essential integrity of its own doctrine concerning man. It is a sufficient preliminary to Christian theology if man be shewn to possess a spiritual nature which is dependent upon God, and this can be shewn by an adequate philosophy. If that nature be proven derivative it is none the less spiritual. The proof, if given, might compel us to revise our Animal Psychology, but would not affect the essentials of Theology.

We do not for a moment suggest that this proof can be given. It seems impossible to analyze apperception into elements that are not apperceptive. Even the simplest forms of human experience and judgement presuppose a spiritual nature which cannot reasonably be derived from anything non-spiritual. If, then, we believe human nature to be derivative, we must believe also at least that every form of life ancestral to man possessed an apperceptive *psyche* capable of developing into the human spirit. That belief is not, *a priori*, an impossible one, but it is unverifiable, and would necessitate an extraordinary revision of biology. But even if, *per impossibile*, verification were forthcoming, the *theological* interest of it would be un-

¹ In England, anthropology is ordinarily regarded as a natural science, and inquiries into the ultimate constitution of human nature are held to pertain to philosophy, not to anthropology. Some Continental writers, however, subsume Philosophy under Anthropology. C. A. S. Rappoport, *Primer of Philosophy*.

important. Man is what he is, and not what his animal progenitors—if, indeed, he have such progenitors—at one time temporarily were; and if the present nature of man be spiritual, *that* is a sufficient basis for Christian doctrine.

Ordinarily, however, the advocates of derivation do not carry back the conception of spirit into the animal series. Their 'animal psychology' is psychology without a *psyche*, and their suggested derivation of human nature would, if accepted, degrade human psychology to the same level; for that derivation purports to shew the development of man's characteristic life out of non-spiritual antecedents. The suggested development is not a development of *spirit*, but only of psychological facts—of the simpler into the more complex. These facts are said to be functions of animal life. Nowhere—neither in man himself nor at any stage of his supposed phylogeny—does spiritual substance or agency appear. This theory is definitely anti-Christian. It cannot be verified by science, and it can be finally refuted by philosophy.

(b) The doctrine of organic development is sometimes presented to us as part of a general evolutionary theory of the universe. Professor Haeckel, for instance, makes it integral in a monistic cosmology which he mistakenly believes to be Spinozistic. The doctrine of the world's substantial unity is not an inference from observed facts. It is, indeed, philosophical rather than scientific, and it existed long before natural science had achieved those progressive integrations which in our own day have made men think the doctrine probable. These integrations are, however, even now, far from complete, and, if we start from them, it is only *per saltum* that we can reach a Monism like Professor Haeckel's—only by an effort of the constructive imagination generically identical with the efforts which have given us unifications avowedly metaphysical.¹

Because, then, the ultimate ground of even Professor

¹ See *A Scientific Monism*, by Arthur Boutwood. (*Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 1901-02.)

Haeckel's Monism is to be found in man's speculative nature, and not in his science, it is quite easy to attach too much importance to the gaps which confessedly still exist between the several departments of man's natural knowledge. These gaps are generally recognized, but they are transcended by the Monistic movement of thought, a movement which, although it undoubtedly derives strength from the integrations of science, is essentially independent of those integrations.

The primary criticism of Professor Haeckel and of those who think like him must be philosophical, not scientific. In particular, it would be unwise to build upon 'vitalism'—upon the doctrine that life is *sui generis*—not derived from physical activities. We may rightly insist that the personal experience and purposive life of man cannot be derived from such activities, but the spiritual life of man is one thing, and the physiological life which he shares with animals and plants is quite another. Theology rightly contends that the former is *substantially* distinct from things 'natural'; but it has no interest in maintaining a like distinctness for the latter. And Professor Haeckel, it must be remembered, does not in so many words attempt to derive the spiritual from the non-spiritual. His doctrine of Substance is not formally materialistic, for he attributes to his primitive substance a psychical nature,¹ and it is from *this* nature, and not from something non-psychical, that he derives the psychical life of man.

If the scientific integration of man's natural knowledge were complete, it would not prove either Materialism or Professor Haeckel's Pan-psychism to be true; its admitted incompleteness does not prove either untrue. We may not attempt to build Christian theology upon the *lacunæ*—which may be only temporary—in our scientific knowledge. Nor can we infer from these *lacunæ* anything conclusive against Professor Haeckel's Monism.

Yet it is quite clear that the Jena Professor's philo-

¹ Because of this attribution he calls his doctrine of Substance Spinozistic; but, at the very best, his creed is only a depraved Spinozism.

sophy—a 'philosophy falsely so called'—is, as he somewhat vulgarly contends, essentially anti-Christian. What, then, should be the line of attack? Hostilities may, we think, be most usefully opened by shewing:

1. That the personal, the apperceptive and purposeful life of man, cannot be derived from the impersonal, non-apperceptive and non-purposive *psyche* of Professor Haeckel's Substance.

2. That, even if we could reasonably believe that Substance to be the ground of all particulars, the unity of those particulars cannot be derived from extended Substance—and Professor Haeckel's Substance appears to be extended—but can be constituted only by an informing and controlling *purpose*, by the intending will of a spiritual existent.

We have already suggested that the uniformity of Nature can be completely set forth only in terms of purpose—not in those of physical becoming. We now suggest that the *unity* of Nature cannot be adequately presented otherwise. Our Monism must be a spiritual Monism, and although it must of necessity be metaphysical, not scientific, we need not therefore distrust it.

(c) The attempt is sometimes made, by means of a theory of religious evolution, to represent Christianity as part of the natural history of man—to assign to it a natural genesis in ethnic beliefs and practices. For our present purpose, we need do little more than refer to what has already been said in an earlier part of this article. It is undoubtedly true that Christianity has borrowed some things from external sources, and that its historical development has in part been shaped by influences similar to those that have fashioned gentile religions. The foundation of Christianity, however, is not to be found in ethnic beliefs and practices, but in a divine fact—that fact which the Church sets forth in the doctrine of the Incarnation. Those who seek to 'naturalize' our faith believe that doctrine to be mythical—to involve a mythical attribution of Godhead to the man Jesus. But the Gospels, which record the Incarnation, are not

mythopœic,¹ and the Epistles, in their witness to the Church's earliest faith, witness to something that presupposes history and not myth.

Has, then, Christianity no part in the religious development of man? Assuredly it has; for it interprets and completes that development. But this does not make it co-ordinate with other faiths. We may say, if we will, that the religious history of man constitutes a unity; but that unity, like the unity of Nature—of which, indeed, it is but an aspect—has its ground, not in the mere sequence of events, but in a spiritual purpose.

(d) To our fathers in the Faith the Christian *credenda* constituted an unchanging deposit, sufficiently given once for all, and therefore incapable of increase; necessary in all its parts, and therefore not to be diminished. The Christian standards of belief were in the past, and, although they were propounded by a present authority, that authority was primarily a witnessing authority, and its witness was to a univocal tradition. It set forth, or it purported to set forth, what Christians had always believed, from the first Whitsuntide onwards. Along the borders of 'the unchanging East' ancient communities, rigidly conservative, stood proudly in the ancient ways, living echoes of Christian antiquity, and to that same antiquity the Catholics of England appealed in order to justify the Reform that had made yet another breach in the polity of Christendom. Even Rome herself—from and not against whom our Tudor forbears had reformed because of her innovations²—even Rome herself claimed but to make articulate what the Church had always held. Throughout Catholic Christendom it was generally agreed that the Church taught truly because she remembered rightly and propounded only her memories. This is still the belief of the great majority of Churchmen.

There are some, however, to whom Christian history, no less than other history, is a process of continual 'becoming'—who trace, in the history of the Church movements which have enlarged the content of Christian belief, and have

¹ See Fairbairn's *Philosophy of the Christian Religion*.

² See Sir Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici* (section 3).

even created new *credenda*. Some regard this development as mischievous or unnecessary, and invite us to return to the real or imagined simplicity of the earliest Christian days. Others accept it, at least along one line—the line which for the present ends in Papal Infallibility—and seek to justify its results. Yet others—men within our own communion—tell us that whatever the Time-process defines bears the marks of the defining time, and receives therefrom characteristics which become obsolete, and limitations which a later day outgrows. From this they infer more or less of freedom from the letter of old definitions—even from formularies which they themselves have subscribed and use.

Now, it is apparent upon the surface of things that, in a world of unceasing change, the Church has not been immobile. And the movement we discern in the history of the Christian Society has affected not only the external order of that Society, but also the beliefs of its members. The writers of *Contentio Veritatis* do not believe precisely what the Nitrian monks believed, nor the Abbé Loisy precisely what St. Anselm believed. Nor has this movement ranged only through private opinions and popular beliefs. The Creeds themselves are moments in it. Christian belief, then, like other bodies of belief, is an historical development, and undoubtedly its development has been furthered and to some extent shaped by psychological forces which have been elsewhere similarly operative. If we go behind this development we reach—what? The life and faith of the infant Church; the life and teaching of our Lord. Potent beyond all other lives, attractive as nothing else has ever been, the life of our Lord is the world's perennial refreshment, His teaching the light of its noblest hope. And to-day there are many who would call us back to Him—would call us from the subtleties of dialectic and the rivalry of parties back to the fresh beauty of the Galilean springtime :

‘ From all vain pomps and shows,
From the pride that overflows

And the false conceits of men,
Back to the simple thought,
By the great Master taught,
"Not he that nameth the name,
"But he that doeth the will!"

'Back to Christ!' The words are inviting. But—Christ? The name contains a theology, and in the first confession of that name centuries of controversy were germinal. 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God'—thus was our Lord first confessed among men, and the confession did more than disclose St. Peter's faith: it defined a problem which Christendom has never been able to ignore.

Return to Christ? Yes, to refresh our faith and to quicken our consciences—to be lifted above our insincerities and compromises into the light that is a consuming fire. Return to Him for this and for such as this we will, but we shall not thereby escape from 'the burden of thought'; for, as we approach Him, we shall meet the question, 'Whom say ye that I am?' and, whatever be our answer, that answer will be the foundation of a theology, and will place us once more at the fruitful beginning of controversy.

And, indeed, it is not in fact to Christ that we are invited to return, but to Jesus not yet recognized as the Christ—to the wayfarer by Jacob's well, to the Teacher on the Mount, to Him who spake as never man yet spake. If we accept the invitation, and, in such way as we can, return to Him, what do we find? A life which, more than any other life recorded in history, needs explanation.

Moreover, that life possesses religious value only when explained. Apart from explanation, we have an attractive Presence, and a teaching which appeals to what is best in us, although it sometimes invites us to the apparently imprudent. But the immediate value of these is ethical, not religious. They quicken us to better things and fill our lives with nobler hope, but the hope given and the more excellent things evoked are *human*—incidents in individual lives—and the value they possess is a *felt* value. Is it also real? Are the things that are 'lovely and of good report'?

more excellent only because we feel them to be better, or also because they further the characteristic endeavour of man's self-determined life?

Now, values, felt values, are determinants of conduct. The characteristic life of man is not aimless, but intending—determined now to this end and now to that, and ends are indicated by values which give direction to his desire and content to his purpose. But a *felt* value is primarily psychological and may be misleading; for there is no immediate inference from *felt* value to *real* value. We desire this or that because of some experienced value which we regard as a foretaste of its worth, but we cannot immediately infer from our desire that the thing we desire is attainable, or that, if attained, it would be really valuable: it might be detrimental. The foundation of life must be ontological, not merely psychological—must rest upon Truth, upon a doctrine of Reality, not upon a merely empirical satisfaction. In other words, life must be reasonable—otherwise we, who are 'little lower than the angels,' should be hardly better than the brutes; for life divorced from reason would be only an instinctive following of chance delights. But life cannot be reasonable unless the values that determine it be, or convincingly seem to be *real* values, and not merely *felt* values.

Goodness, we are told, is its own reward. True, but what is goodness? Not mere conscientiousness—the satisfaction that comes from a good conscience is *not* a sufficient ground for the good life—not merely an inclination towards the Right, but a concrete embodiment of the Right, a practical way of living which sets forth, not merely an aspiration, but also an achievement, and realizes the end that conscience indicates. Goodness consists, not in a mere inclination towards the moral ideal, not even in conscientious endeavours towards it, but in the gradual achievement of that ideal. But how do we know that achievement—complete achievement—is possible? We do not know, and to many history has suggested a negative which makes goodness ironical, and its felt attraction a preliminary to pessimism. Ethics, as the science of conduct, must have its ground in

metaphysics, because the good life, as a practicable ideal, presupposes a natural order which, if not itself good, is at least patient of goodness.

Not otherwise is it with the Christian life. Christ is attractive—'I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me'—and His call is inviting. But is the Christian vocation a reasonable vocation—one which determines life to reasonable ends? If we obey the call of Christ we have to turn aside from many a near pleasure, to forego many a fair-seeming opportunity for distinction and profit. We have to take up our cross daily, to 'crucify the flesh, with the affections and lusts thereof,' to know, for and in ourselves, the temptations of the wilderness, the bitterness of Gethsemane, the final renunciation of Calvary. Is the vocation which calls us to *this* a reasonable vocation? It may be that, in the full springtime of strength, we have seen near at hand 'all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them,' and a not ignoble great-mindedness has prompted us to enter and possess. But Christ calls us to another Kingdom and a different glory. Once more, is His call reasonable?

He has Himself answered the question. Because He is what He is—throughout all future ages God Incarnate—His call is a reasonable call, and the values wherewith He attracts us are real values—attainable, permanent, consummating. The nature of our Lord discloses the character of that other Nature which subsists in Him. Because He is what He is, His vocation is a reasonable vocation, the ideal He proposes is a valid ideal, the hope He quickens is a sure and certain hope. The Christian life, then, is a reasonable life because of the disclosure of Reality made by the Christian revelation—by the Person, the Life, and the Work of our Lord. That revelation is the primary deposit committed to the Church, and the Church's primary duty is to preserve that deposit unimpaired, and to renew the witness of it in and to each succeeding age.

Now, the Christian revelation has its ground in certain historical facts. It is, indeed, a revelation of *truth*—a revelation of the Divine Fatherhood—but the truth is

manifest and commended to us in and through a Person and a Life. These historical facts—the Personality* and Life of our Lord—are the primary elements in ‘the faith once for all delivered to the saints.’ They have come to us, even as they came to the first believers, not as mere events, but as significant events; and, from the very beginning of Christian history, the Church has sought to fulfil its mission by setting forth that significance and preserving it from derogation. It has no power to add to the deposit which it has received; it has no right to subtract therefrom. Its primary function is that of a missionary witness; its primary duty is to make convincingly plain the reality and meaning of the Incarnation.

Therefore, its work has been explanatory and definitive. It has had to set forth that which it received, and to preserve the meaning, and therefore the power, of that gift from depravation. In the discharge of this duty it has sometimes essayed definitions that seem speculative; but its interest, even when its work has been most clearly metaphysical, has always been a practical interest. *Non in dialectica complacuit Deo salvum facere populum suum*: not by dialectic, but by a Person and a Life, and the definitions of the Creeds are but attempts to refresh the Church’s memory of the Son of Man, to keep effectual our apprehension of Him who is our Life.

The Christian revelation is operative unto salvation not by some process or transaction entirely external to us, but only in proportion as it becomes determinant of life through a re-creating faith. It is efficacious unto life eternal, not as a thing given, but as a thing received. Christ becomes our life through the apprehension of faith, and of His fulness we receive in proportion to the receptivity of our apprehending faith. Were the world’s faith in Him to become a faith in one who is only ‘of *like* substance with the Father,’ men would not for long continue to receive the full ‘benefits of His Passion.’ Were His assumption of manhood Docetic, our ideals would still remain unverified.

And because the religious value of our Lord thus has its ground in His metaphysical nature, the Church has not

hesitated to be boldly definitive—not in order to add a new chapter to the history of human curiosity, but to defend the foundation of man's holiest hope and of his worthiest life. 'If Christ be not risen from the dead, then is your faith vain,' was the Apostolic message to some of the first believers, and in her formal definitions the Church does but variously repeat that authoritative warning.

The development of the Church's standards witnesses, therefore, to the vigilance of the Christian Society against errors that, if accepted, would have depraved the faith which that Society exists to guard and set forth; and Spirit-guided though we believe that Society to be, its utterances are obviously human—addressed to human minds, expressed in human terms. Therefore they are not free from the relativity which marks all things human. Each is shaped by the need that occasioned it, and by the vocabulary of contemporary thought. And, because the vocabulary of thought is not permanent, phrases taken from the living speech of one age require a commentary in the next, and can reach the minds of the unlearned only through translation.

When the Church repeats the œcumenical definitions of the earliest age her speech seems archaic, and some think it therefore less valuable. It is clear, for instance, that the Nicene category of 'substance' is not the Hegelian category. But we know sufficiently what the Nicene Fathers meant to affirm when they used it to define the Nature of our Lord, and, although their speech is foreign to us, their meaning is intelligible and valuable—as valuable to us as to them. We may, if we will and can, for our private profit or missionary advantage, put the thought into modern dress—translate the *homoousion*,—but if we do we are only useful servants of Catholic tradition, not pioneers of freedom.

It is a mere misconception to say that the Church imposes upon thought the fetters of an obsolete philosophy. Its definitions re-affirm the ultimate evangelical facts. They are not so much new interpretations as attempts to preserve the original interpretations received from our

Lord Himself and from His Apostles. The primary allegiance of our thought is to those evangelical facts in the primitive freshness of their meaning and value. If we can re-present them in a form more acceptable to our own day than is the patristic re-presentation, we are at liberty to do so, but the patristic re-presentation will remain as valuable as ever—and, for its own purposes, as valid as ever. We can gain only a *practical* advantage by the most accurate translation, and by no translation or re-presentation can we increase the freedom of the Christian theologian and the Christian philosopher. Indeed, the polemic against the metaphysic of the Creeds ceases to be trivial only when it disguises a changed attitude towards the evangelical *facts*.

(e) We have said that the Christian religion is based upon a certain divine episode in history,—upon the historical revelation wherein and whereby God, in the Person of Christ, commended to us His love. The facts of this revelation constitute the primary deposit committed to the Church, and the Church exists to set forth these facts efficaciously to each succeeding age, 'for the healing of the nations.' We say to set them forth *efficaciously*. The Church is more than a witnessing Church; she is a missionary Church. She has not only to set forth the evangelical facts in their evangelical significance, but has to make those facts persuasive in the hearts and minds of men. The Christian revelation had its ground in a practical purpose, and the Church, which sets forth that revelation, is instrumental to that purpose: it is appointed to continue, through all earthly time, that renewing and saving work in the lives of men which was commenced by our Lord Himself. And in performing this work it has to explain the revelation it sets forth, and to develop the evangelical significance of that revelation into a reasonable faith. Everywhere those who, however imperfectly, have essayed to do this work have spoken, not only to the hearts of men, but also to their minds, and have attempted to make thought re-present, in a form intellectually credible, the content of Faith. Hence have arisen the theologies of Christendom.

Now, if it be true that even the œcumenical creeds are

not exempt from the relativity which characterizes all human thought, yet more clearly and widely is it true that the several bodies of Christian theology are marked by the same relativity. Local and personal preoccupations with this or that particular element in the content of Christian belief, temporary ways of thought and modes of feeling, have all left marks of limitation upon the several bodies of doctrine whereby Christian men have variously tried to set forth the truth wherein they have found life.

Christian thought is part of the general movement of thought, and we can detect in its several forms the principal phases of that movement. German theology differs from Alexandrian partly, at least, because it is informed by a different philosophy—because Kant and Hegel were not Neo-Platonists. Calvin's thought was dominated by a conception of the Divine Nature which seems to us to-day Muhammadan rather than Christian, and his initial mistake has left its impress upon his entire system. Similarly, Luther's preoccupation with his characteristic doctrine of 'salvation by faith' was a disturbing preoccupation, and one scarcely less potent than Calvin's. The Roman doctrine of transubstantiation has its ground in a metaphysical theory which, although at one time general among the learned of Western Europe, is not now taught outside the Roman Catholic schools; and many forms of English religion have been largely influenced by an exaggerated individualism which has ignored the mediating work of the witnessing and edifying Church. The Thirty-nine Articles speak to us in a language we are forgetting of controversies we have forgotten, and the succession of more or less valuable opinions which embody the post-Reformation theology of the Church of England reflect every important change in English thought and in the interests of English life.

In the presence of these diversities, of this universal relativity, the question immediately arises:—Is there, then, no theological authority that can tell us, with sufficient certainty, what Christian men ought to believe? Probably few would answer this question negatively, and,

indeed a negative answer would be misleading. But it seems quite clear that the ordinary affirmative answers promise too much.

There are those who tell us that the Holy Scriptures are the ground and standard of theological truth. But what is the nature of Scriptural authority, and what is its range? We must remember that the Christian Scriptures were not intended to be manuals of theology. They are, indeed, full of theological teaching; but that teaching is fragmentary, occasional, incidental, and contains many things that are hard to be understood. Moreover, the Apostolic writings bear the clear impress of the Time-spirit. Indeed, the closer our scrutiny of these writings, the clearer does it become that they do not teach *sub specie æternitatis*—that the presentation of Christian doctrine is a temporal mode of presentation. For instance, St. Paul's doctrine of original sin seems to be a moment in a long development which goes back far into Jewish history, and has its ground in the undated narratives with which the Hebrew Scriptures commence.¹

Those narratives point back to remote ethnic mythologies, and we are now discovering that their religious value has its ground in the purpose and process which transformed those crude imaginings of the world's early darkness into the lucid poetry of new spiritual conceptions. Now, it seems permissible, if not obligatory, to interpret some things in the New Testament in the same way—to regard them as Christian adaptations of non-Christian beliefs. By such adaptation those beliefs were 'baptized into Christ,' and received Christian value and significance. They became organic to a new spirit and a new thought, which they express—not *sub specie æternitatis*, but in temporal modes. When the times change, and new conceptions rule the thoughts of men, re-statement becomes necessary. But re-statement should be not of the temporal mode which has become obsolete, but of the Christian content which that mode at one time made intelligible. In other words, our

¹ Cf. F. R. Tennant, *The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin*.

interpretation of the Christian Scriptures must be guided by the thought of *purpose*. We must look beyond the written word to the Christian conception which the written word was intended to set forth.

But, if this be true, it is necessary to revise the ordinary conception of Scriptural authority. Apostolic theology is a temporal presentation of evangelical truth—of the truth once for all given to the world in and through the Incarnation, in and through that significant divine history which constitutes the Christian revelation. *This*—this revelation—is what a Christian man ought to believe. '*This* is the Catholic Faith.' Outside what is revealed we have only temporal modes of presentation, valuable only in so far as they make our apprehension of our Lord efficacious unto life.¹ Theology has a practical end, and we derive the criterion of its value from the purpose that informs it.

There are others who find theological authority in the teaching of the Church, and who accept as certainly true whatever has always been generally believed throughout the Christian Society. Now, the Church's unbroken representation of the primary evangelical deposit is, doubtless, of fundamental importance for Christian life and thought; but her re-presentation of those facts in formal theology is a re-presentation subject to historical conditions,—to human interests, to human knowledge, to the forms and usages of human thought. If a given re-presentation be, indeed, universal and perduring, those notes—which are sometimes said to be notes of catholicity—may indicate nothing more than the universal presence of relatively permanent conditions.

Once again the thought of *purpose* recurs. The re-presentations which are integral in Christian belief are re-presentations in temporal modes—not *sub specie æternitatis*. The authority of the Church is primarily the authority of a witnessing Society, and that authority does not extend to her temporal modes of re-presentation. These, like the Apostolic re-presentations, are 'valuable only in so far as they make our apprehension of our Lord efficacious unto life';

¹ At this point the philosophy of Christian belief becomes part of the general Philosophy of Probability.

but they do not constitute a completely authoritative *corpus* of doctrine.

Is it said that the Church is not merely a human society, but the Spirit-bearing Body which inherits the unfulfilling promises of her Lord? True, but why were those promises made? why the Spirit given? In order, we say, that the Christian revelation might be perennially effective for the salvation of the world. Yet again the thought of *purpose* recurs. Our Lord made and keeps His Church a Divine Society, stronger than the gates of hell, in order that men may be saved through Him—through living apprehension of the ‘full, perfect, and sufficient’ revelation made once for all in His unique Person and uniquely beneficial death. We may not extend the Divine help beyond the range of the Divine purpose. That purpose is accomplished when Christ Crucified is evidently set forth, and men, apprehending that exhibited Love, find therein their life. But the intellectual modes which, through re-presentative thought, help their apprehension belong to the world’s changing history, and not to that unchanging deposit which the Church exists to guard and set forth, to the greater glory of God, through all earthly ages.

ART. VIII.—EDUCATION AND POLITICS.

The Education (England and Wales) Bill, 1906.

It is the profound conviction of the Liberal party that every reform in education, as in fact in every other department of life, is their work, and that we owe nothing to the Conservatives. Whether, however, this pious opinion will stand the test of facts is very doubtful. Certainly more was done for education during the tenure of office of the late Government than at any previous period in the history of the country. Let us take, to begin with, that which is the most important if the least considered part of our educational system—the foundation of universities. In 1898, after three commissions and intrigues extending over some-

thing like thirty years, the University of London Education Act was passed, and in 1900 London was for the first time provided with a teaching university; while since then Birmingham, Leeds, Liverpool, and Sheffield have all received charters for universities. In other directions what has been done is better known. A Government department dealing with all gradations of education below that of universities has been organized and made efficient. A register of teachers was formed, which was the first step towards putting the teaching profession on the same level as other learned professions. In the Education Act of 1902 for the first time an educational system was given to the whole country. Finally, just before they left office the Government added to what they had already done by raising the Treasury grant to University Colleges from 27,000*l.* to 100,000*l.* Compared with the money given for elementary education the subsidies to higher education from the State are still ridiculously small, but this last increase has been most beneficial in its results.

But it is not only what they accomplished but certain principles that underlay the work of the late Government which mark so decided an advance. They realized that no wise reform can take place which does not start from the existing conditions; that the business of the constructive statesman is to organize and to create and never to destroy. The University of London Act will illustrate our meaning. Various schemes had been in the air. One was to create two or even three universities. There were various drastic ideas about interfering with the autonomy of independent bodies which had been teaching in some cases for a very long period. Ultimately wiser counsels prevailed, and a university was founded which, though not perfect, was perhaps the best that circumstances allowed. In the new organization were included the old examining University and all the different teaching bodies of London, without their independence being destroyed; and the University was left to work out for itself its own problems. So in elementary and secondary education the Act of 1902 did not introduce any unwise measures for destroying schools;

but in both spheres alike it recognized that existing educational effort of every sort should be respected, that what was needed was not to create a dead level of uniformity, but to establish an organization which might co-ordinate and supplement the work already being done. Thus all the different bodies who were eager in various ways for education might be united in a common purpose. Education in this country demands the encouragement and not the stifling of individual effort.

An even still more important feature of the Act of 1902 was that it made the first step towards introducing principles of religious liberty into education. There was a time in this country when a large section of the people were cut off from educational advantages by the imposition of one form of religious belief on all or nearly all classes of the community. A hundred years ago the Nonconformist had a very real grievance. He was deprived of the opportunity of university education: there were very few schools or colleges where his children could be properly educated. We are suffering now from that narrowness in the past. But the process of reaction has introduced a new form of religious intolerance. Those who suffered from the unfair endowment of the religious teaching of the Church of England have shewn a similar unfairness in attempting to impose that curious hybrid called 'undenominationalism' on all schools alike, and have refused to others the religious liberty of which they quite justly complained of having been deprived. The Act of 1902 was the first step—we hope it may not be the last—towards introducing a juster system of religious education. It was not perfect, it was unfair to Church people in some particulars, in many villages it was undoubtedly unfair to Nonconformists, but it was fairer to Church people and Nonconformists; alike than any previous Act. We attempted at the time to urge the Government to proceed further, but although broad-minded men like Mr. Balfour recognized the defects of the Act it was really quite impossible for more to be accomplished than was done. But a real step had been made in advance, and we should welcome now any effort made on the wise lines which

had been laid down for making religious conditions—especially for Nonconformists—more just. We certainly do not think that any real friend of education can complain of what was done during the ten years of Conservative rule.

Whether the Liberal Government, which is so convinced of the errors of its opponents and so certain of its own merits, will accomplish as much we sorely doubt. There is very great danger indeed of a retrograde movement. There are as a matter of fact three very serious dangers to which education is exposed at this moment. The first is the danger which has arisen from the reform of the Board of Education. Five years ago it was notorious as the most indolent of all the Government offices. We have to thank the Conservatives for having had the courage to appoint a head to the office, who, whatever mistakes he has committed, has certainly transformed it into one of the most energetic and in some ways most enlightened of Government offices. But efficiency in a Government department unfortunately nearly always means a tendency to extend its powers, and there is very considerable danger at the present time that certain departments of the Board of Education may encroach beyond their legitimate functions. Even more dangerous is the excessive ambition of local authorities. If anything were needed to justify the Act of 1902 it would be found in the vigorous and keen way in which almost every local authority has taken up its work. Throughout most of the counties and boroughs, whatever mistakes have been made—it is quite natural that mistakes should be made when people are for the first time faced with very delicate problems—there can be no doubt of the zealousness which has been shewn, a zeal which has been to a large extent independent of party or class or religious opinion. But here, again, there is the danger of the new broom which has not yet discovered that it cannot do everything. To manage every school by itself, never to delegate authority, to desire administrative and religious uniformity, to imagine that it can govern universities just as well as every elementary school, these are faults which have appeared. Education in this country will not be wisely and soberly managed

until the local authorities have learned some of the wisdom and statesmanship which have dictated recent educational advance, until they have realized that there is nothing more dangerous than a rigid and uniform system, that they should be prepared to delegate authority as much as they can to subordinate bodies, that they should encourage and guide rather than suppress individual and voluntary effort, and that they should rally round the cause of education the interests of all religious bodies alike. Still more dangerous than these, which are both, after all, faults which arise out of an excess of ill-disciplined virtue, is the narrow and intolerant spirit which characterizes one section of the religious community. Until this is overcome neither sound education nor religious liberty will be possible in the country. If the principle which the Passive Resistance movement embodies were carried out consistently government itself would become impossible.

It is unfair to judge some of the performances of the present Government too rapidly. We cannot think that they have justified themselves in their proposal to abolish the Register of Teachers. It seems very like a concession to the worst spirit of a narrow trade-unionism. We hear ominous rumours, which we hope may not be justified, of attempts to injure the University of London and to interfere with an institution which, though far from perfect, is steadily carrying out its work of organizing university education in London. We hear ominous rumours, too, of attempts on the part of the London County Council, which is strong in the new Parliament, to transgress its proper functions. The new charter for the Welsh University and action on the part of the Board of Education with regard to the training of teachers alike suggest that an attempt may be made (an attempt which would be most disastrous in its consequences) to interfere with the autonomy of the Universities. We do not like the policy which is suggested by the Commission on Trinity College, Dublin. It is undoubtedly true that a university for Ireland, which will satisfy the religious sentiments of the majority of the people and be adequately endowed out of public funds, is essential

for the good government of the country; but the Nonconformist supporters of the Government would never allow an act of real justice to Ireland. It looks very much as if an attempt were to be made to gratify the religious intolerance of English Nonconformists and to attempt to satisfy the Roman Catholics of Ireland by destroying the character of Trinity College, Dublin. We can safely say that any movement of that kind may succeed in gratifying the Nonconformists, but it will be most injurious to education and will not satisfy the Roman Catholics. If they had an adequate University of their own they would be prepared to allow Trinity College to remain as the University of one section of the people and would support a University for Belfast which would be largely Presbyterian in its character. Here, as elsewhere, a bold Liberal policy would satisfy every thoughtful man. There is great danger that the Government policy which seems suggested will fail for an Irish University, as statesmen have always failed in the past, through unwillingness to be boldly just.

It will be unfortunately necessary for us to devote most of this article to elementary education, but before doing so we must say one word about secondary education. It is clear that there is a movement on foot for introducing into this sphere the same religious narrowness which characterizes the now notorious Education Bill. We quote from the *Times* newspaper the following account of a question which was addressed to the President of the Board of Education and his answer. Both are extraordinarily lengthy and contain that mass of verbiage which is usually used to conceal a policy, but no one who can read between the lines and who knows the influences which are being brought to bear upon the present Government can doubt that it outlines a policy (which is only not carried out because of the financial difficulties which it would involve) of reducing all secondary schools to the same level of religious inadequacy to which it is intended that all elementary schools should be reduced.

‘Mr. Lehmann, having asked what restrictions, if any, with regard to the religious denomination of pupils or teachers and

public control over the management at present exist in the secondary schools recognized as eligible for grants by the Board ; whether a local authority is allowed in the allocation of its grants in aid to distinguish between such schools on the ground of religion ; and whether the Government contemplates, by legislation or otherwise, securing that after a certain date grants shall be given only to schools in which there is no denominational disqualification of teachers or pupils, and which are subject to popular control. Mr. Birrell says :—So far as concerns the Board's regulations for the Parliamentary grants in respect of secondary schools—(1) no school is eligible unless it admits day scholars freely upon a full conscience clause, and (2) no restrictions of any kind are laid down in regard to the teaching staff except that of educational efficiency ; while (3) each school must have a governing body constituted in a manner approved by the Board upon which in the majority of cases there is some representation of the local authority, though this is not yet laid down as an invariable condition in the regulations. (4) With the exception above named the current regulations of the Board, being drawn in conformity with the principles of existing legislation, do not restrict the Exchequer grants to such secondary schools as have no denominational or undenominational restrictions upon pupils or staff ; and schools of very varying types in this respect, some with and some without the characteristics referred to, are at present on the list of State-aided secondary schools. As regards grants in aid of secondary schools from the rates or the local taxation fund, a local authority is precluded by section 4 (1) of the Act of 1902 from requiring 'that any particular form of religious instruction or worship, or any religious catechism or formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination, shall or shall not be taught, used, or practised in any school, college, or hostel aided, but not provided, by the council.' I am not aware of any other religious distinctions which a local authority is statutorily precluded from making. The suggested policy referred to in the third paragraph of the question, which raises problems of grave importance and would have far-reaching effects, has been receiving the serious attention of his Majesty's Government. In this connexion it must be noted that local authorities have as yet themselves provided secondary schools to a very limited extent, and in many cases shew great reluctance to incur rate expenditure in this direction, and the large number of efficient secondary schools which would be affected by the proposal are in nearly

all cases greatly needed at present for the supply of secondary education in their respective districts. I am, therefore, not yet prepared to state that they could, without either imposing a burden on the ratepayers which they are apparently unwilling to accept or without inflicting too serious a loss to our existing educational provision, be henceforth deprived of those public moneys upon which depends in almost all cases their efficiency, and in many their very existence. And this is the case, whether it be a question merely of the cessation of the Parliamentary grants, which is a matter of departmental regulation, or, further, of the prohibition of all local grants in aid, which would, of course, require legislation. I may add that the number of secondary schools which, taking last year's figures, are subject to full popular control, and presumably have no denominational disqualification for teachers or pupils, is, I believe, not more than eighty schools out of the total of some 500 State-aided secondary schools, so far as England (apart from Wales) is concerned; and, so long as this is the case, any Minister responsible for the secondary education of this country must deliberate very seriously before adopting the policy to which, but for these difficulties, he might unhesitatingly adhere.

So far the administration of the Board of Education in relation to Secondary Education has been broad and tolerant; but this reply clearly foreshadows a new departure, and unless the Government admits wiser and more tolerant counsellors than it seems to have at present it may do even more than it has done to excite religious strife in the country. Whatever difficulties may exist in regard to elementary education do not exist in secondary schools. It is quite possible within certain limits for different religious opinions to be represented. All that is required is a spirit of justice and fairness, and unless that is the characteristic, both of the Government and of local authorities, there will be continuous religious discontent.

But we must return, unfortunately, to the Bill which is to be named the Education Act of 1906. We shall make it perfectly clear, as we proceed, that we have always recognized, as we stated at the time, that the Act of 1902 was only a transition measure, that an advance would be necessary in the future. We were prepared then, as we are prepared now, under fair conditions, to give up the dual

system, as it is called. We are anxious to meet the legitimate demands of Nonconformists in every way that is possible. We would gladly have supported any measure of the present Government which shewed signs of real fairness and wisdom. It is well known that many Churchmen were not at all satisfied with the Act of 1902, and thought that a mistake had been made from every point of view in attempting to preserve the control of the schools. We do not, therefore, approach the question in any spirit of antagonism to reform, but we do not hesitate to say that the proposed Act is fundamentally bad. What is required and what the country demands is, so far as possible, an Act which would give such recognition to religion and religious opinion as would prevent religious strife in future and enable people to co-operate in the improvement of education. The one thing the present Bill will not and cannot do is to appease the religious strife : it will only intensify it.

The first thing which is demanded is that the local authority should have complete control in all schools, and that the dual system should be done away with. Now it is possible to find arguments in favour of the dual system. A certain number of schools in towns, under private or something approaching private management, would probably be an advantage. No change can be made which does not entail some disadvantages. But we are prepared absolutely to support the policy that all or an overwhelming majority of the schools of the country should be under definite public management. Speaking from the experience of a country clergyman, we are convinced that the management of the schools by the parson alone is not good for either the parson or the village. We hope, and we have no reason to doubt, that in the vast majority of the villages of the country he could take his place as one of the elected managers ; but we certainly feel that the people of the village, and not the parson, ought to be able to speak of 'our' school. But while recognizing this, we must emphasize another point. When once the education authorities and the public become responsible for the management of the whole of the education of the country, it must be on the

condition of absolute equality for different religious opinions. The Cowper-Temple system was never justifiable. It was possible for Anglicans and Roman Catholics to acquiesce in it so long as they had their own schools, their own teachers, and their own religious instruction. But when these go the situation is entirely changed. Henceforth every reasonable effort must be made to treat all the different religious bodies in an equal manner. Now, this is exactly what the present Bill does not do. It takes one particular form of religious instruction, and imposes that upon all classes in a district under one authority. What *that* is may vary indefinitely. There may be no religious instruction at all; but in any case a situation is created in which the will of the majority is allowed to impose its teaching upon everyone, whatever his opinion may be. This is obviously unfair and unjust.

We will venture briefly to criticize the proposals of the present Bill from what we have always held to be the Nonconformist point of view. The Nonconformist has laid down that it is unjust to make a person pay for religious teaching of which he does not approve, and he has professed to hold that principle so strongly that he has refused to pay his rates rather than allow it to be broken. In his own case he again and again affirms that the State has nothing to do with religion. The one thing that he has always made clear is that he objects to the establishment of any form of religious teaching. Now, we do not agree with these principles; but at any rate they are principles which, if consistently carried out for the benefit of others, as well as of himself, would demand our respect. But what does the present Bill do? It takes one particular form of religious instruction—namely, undenominationalism: it imposes that upon every school, and makes those who do not approve of such teaching pay for it; it forbids the support from State money of any other form; it endows this at the expense of the State, and hampers, if it does not in many cases entirely prohibit, any other form of teaching. Now, it is maintained in support of this proposal that undenominationalism is not Nonconformity.

This may or may not be the case. Certainly undenominationalism exactly represents the religious teaching which has been provided in the British and Wesleyan schools founded and supported by Nonconformists. But whether that be the case or not, it represents a form of religious teaching of which Nonconformists approve, and of which Anglicans, Roman Catholics, and Jews emphatically disapprove. No doubt it is very wicked in them to do so; it is a great misfortune, from the Nonconformist point of view, that they are not prepared to acquiesce in what the Nonconformists like. But exactly similar arguments might be used by a Roman Catholic majority in a Roman Catholic country. The only argument, in fact, which will justify the system started by the present Education Bill would equally justify a Church of England majority in imposing a Church of England catechism on all schools, or a Roman Catholic majority in imposing their own teaching in a similar manner. It violates the most fundamental principles of religious liberty; it violates every principle for which Nonconformists have fought in the past; and it makes it perfectly clear that a very large amount of the support of this Bill comes from political Nonconformists who desire to injure the Church of England.

It is, then, impossible for this Bill, in its present form, to solve the problem. It starts from a wrong principle, and nothing can make a wrong principle right. But it is impossible also not to marvel at the extraordinary character of those modifications which are introduced to give to the Bill an appearance of fairness, or rather to enable it to pass. Something might be said, though we think it is fundamentally wrong, for having undenominational teaching in all schools, provided religious facilities, with reasonable and proper safeguards, were granted universally to those who were not contented with what the school supplied. Objections have been made to religious facilities as interfering with the work of the school. The present Bill does not recognize such difficulties, for it grants facilities in non-provided schools: it does not grant them in any others. The result of that is that the old dual system still remains;

there will still be two classes of schools. The Bill is so framed that in large areas it does not give any concession to those who dislike undenominationalism. We do not think it is necessary to say much about Clause 4. Its bias is obvious. It is introduced simply as a concession, which will apply to a large number of Roman Catholic schools, and will apply to a much smaller number of Church of England schools. It does not please the supporters of the Government; it does not satisfy those it is intended to satisfy. It has been confessed by Mr. Lloyd-George that it is intended to be unfair to the Church of England, and with the latest amendments which have been introduced it becomes ridiculous and unworkable. The real fact is that if a Bill starts on a fundamentally unsound principle no tinkering and no concession will make it just; the Bill will fail because it is bad in itself.

But we have a further complaint to make against the Bill. At the present time nothing is more needful than money for the cost of higher education, and it will be very difficult for a Government, which has put economy in the forefront of its policy, to satisfy all the needs of those who are attempting to reform the country out of the public funds. Of the money likely to be available for educational purposes this Bill takes a million and gives it to elementary education, and we will venture to say that not one single additional advantage will come to the country from the spending of that money. It is using money not to improve education but to destroy religious liberty. In order to carry out the policy of the proposed Act trust deeds will have to be violated, and it is thought that a certain amount of compensation in money will help to make this easier. We have not such a poor opinion of either the Churchmen or the Roman Catholics of this country as to think for a moment that a certain amount of money will compensate them for the destruction of the purpose with which the schools were founded.

But we have still a further complaint to make against the Bill. It is well known that a large section of the working men of this country are in favour of secular education. That

they are so does not arise entirely because they are in favour of secularism. It comes from the feeling which is predominant in their minds, that the interests of education are sacrificed in the continuous struggle on religious questions. We are not certain that even this is proven, because we believe an interest in the religious question has made many persons take an interest in education who would not have done so otherwise; but we do sympathize very strongly with them in the feeling which one of their more prominent members has expressed, that the controversies about religion in relation to education are very detrimental to religious reverence. It has been said that the bulk of the working men have been brought up under the ægis of Church schools, and that the only result is to make them secularists. We do not think that this is true. The bulk of the working classes who are secularists in their tendency are those who have been brought up in the great cities, and have been educated for the most part in the Board schools, and who, above all, have been shocked—and we believe rightly shocked—by the religious controversies which were introduced into the arena of School Board elections. One of the great advantages of the 1902 Act, one of the reasons why the abolition of the School Board and the creation of the Education Committees of the county and borough councils was strongly supported, was that it would do away with these controversies. Henceforth education was to be managed not by a body elected *ad hoc*, but by a body elected for general county or city purposes, which would, it was hoped, be elected to a considerable extent, at any rate, without regard to the religious question. Moreover, so far as regards religious instruction the duties of the local authority were largely administrative. It could be a little more or less fair to the non-provided schools, but if it obeyed the law it was bound to be fair to all alike, and the place for religious dissension was reduced to a minimum. The Act has certainly worked well in that way over the greater part of the country, wherever the law has been obeyed. But the new Bill, by putting everything again into the hands of a majority of the local authority, will reintroduce, unless

the Bill is very fundamentally changed, the religious question in every direction. The local authority will have the power to give, or not to give, religious instruction, and to settle what that is to be in all schools; it will have power, as the Bill is at present constituted, to be very disagreeable about granting special facilities under Clause 4; it will have power to try to make very unjust terms in taking over Voluntary schools. The whole religious controversy is being brought back; it is quite possible that in the future local elections in some cases may turn on a contest between the secularists and the religious party, the secularists being determined to keep all religious teaching out of all schools.

We are clear, then, that the present Bill must fail, and must fail because it is constructed on a wrong principle. What should the principle be upon which an Act must be built up? It is quite clear it must recognize that the different forms of religious teaching which are desired must all be given so far as is possible in the State-provided schools. Of course one method of meeting the difficulty is a purely secular system of education. That is just one of those methods which are thought by a superficial observer to be fair. It is fair, of course, as between all the different religious bodies. All are treated equally badly. But it is not fair on the broad principle of whether education should be religious or not. It is as unjust to compel a person to pay rates and taxes to support a secular system of religious teaching which he holds to be disastrous to the country, and to refuse assistance to any other form, as it is to make him support any particular form of religious opinion. There is no real fairness about such a suggestion, and it is quite plain that it is contrary to the desires of the vast majority of people in the country. We may dismiss, then, that solution.

We come back, now, and ask what should be the principle that we lay down. It is quite clear that religious instruction should be given in accordance with the wishes of the parents of the children, so far as is possible. Now, when we lay this down as a principle which ought to be followed,

we are at once told that it is very wonderful that the Church should take up this attitude, that it is something quite new, and that it is not really sincere. As against this we would quote the following passage, which we wrote when the Act of 1902 was discussed. We then laid down that this was the one principle, the one logical principle, upon which religious education should be organized, and we know that this represented the opinion of a large number of Churchmen at that time. There were some, of course, who had not then thought out the question completely. We are glad to say that so far as we can see the great bulk of Church people have now come to recognize the truth of this principle, and we hope that a few more years may be sufficient to convert the great majority of the nation.

"Undenominationalism," then, is as unfair as pure secularism; but as a matter of fact there is no need of either. There is a much better basis for any system in going back to certain fundamental principles. Let the religious teaching of the children be in accordance with the wishes of the parent. The parent is responsible for his children. Primarily he is responsible for the whole education of the child, but for very good reasons the State relieves him of a large part of that burden; yet he still remains responsible, and should be held responsible, for deciding what should be the religious education of his children. The exact arrangement may vary, but, whatever the arrangement, this is the true principle.'¹

Again, it is said that the Church is not prepared to carry this out consistently—for example, that it would not allow Unitarian or Mormon teaching to be given in its schools. With regard to the latter we are quite sure that it would not. There must be a clear and definite limit to the freedom which would be allowed in religious teaching. No nation can allow what is detrimental to public morality or to the well-being of the country. With regard to the Unitarians, we will say frankly that, supposing there were a sufficient number of Unitarian children attending a school, and that there were no school near where they could get teaching such as they desire, we certainly consider that

¹ *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. lv. p. 188, Oct. 1902.

they should have full facilities, and that it should be given at the expense of the State, just so far as any other religious teaching is given.

We are convinced, then, both of the soundness of the principle and of our own sincerity in advocating it, and we are convinced also that it is only by recognizing this as the principle upon which religious instruction is to be given in the future that any settlement of the education question can be arrived at. The difficulty which arises is, How can it be carried out in practice? Well, it is very probable that it cannot be carried out with perfect fairness: we can never get perfect fairness in this world. But it is one thing to have a sound principle which is carried out as fairly as circumstances allow—because any improvement or any change may be for the better. It is quite another thing to have a wrong principle—because that must always and everywhere be unfair, and one can only mitigate the necessary unfairness. As a matter of fact, it seems apparent that there would be very little difficulty in developing a system which would be perfectly fair in the vast majority of cases. There are, as a matter of fact, only four different religious opinions which normally demand consideration—Church of England teaching; Undenominational Bible teaching, which quite clearly satisfies the great body of Nonconformists; Roman Catholic, and Jewish teaching. The number of Unitarians among the ranks of those who attend elementary schools is so small that their needs may always be met by the grant of special facilities, and it will always be possible, if necessary, to arrange for ‘moral’ instruction for those who are purely secularists.

We thus have a problem which any reasonable amount of statesmanship might quite well solve. On what lines can we suggest that it would be possible? We will venture to formulate certain principles which we think might be followed. First, a definite and adequate time ought to be laid down in all schools for religious instruction. Secondly, there should be a general provision, which could take the place of the Cowper-Temple clause, that local authorities were to arrange for education in accordance with the wishes

of the parents. Then, thirdly, the question arises, Who is to pay for this? Shall it be paid for by the religious bodies, or shall it be paid for by the community? We are prepared to acquiesce in either alternative. Personally we believe that it would be very much fairer, especially for Nonconformists, if this instruction were given by the community. But if, of course, they adhere to their principle that they will not allow any religious education of which they do not approve to be paid for out of the rates, then the other alternative must come in. In that case instruction will be given at the expense of the different religious bodies under the direction and control of the local authority, which will be bound to see that there is absolute fair play, and which will be responsible for discipline and for order, and will provide the rooms and the appliances, but will not pay for the teaching. Fourthly, who is to give the teaching? It is quite clear that every religious body would insist that the teaching should be given by persons who believed in it, and who gave it willingly and heartily. On the other hand, there is an immense advantage in the instruction being given by the regular teachers. We venture to suggest that the following plan would help to solve the problem: Let it be laid down quite clearly that no teacher *need* give religious instruction, but that every teacher *may* give it, there being, of course, a separate arrangement with him for that purpose. Now, so far as our experience goes, teachers wish to give the religious instruction. The majority of them are upright and religious men, who have at heart the welfare of the children whom they teach, and therefore they would take care so far as possible to go to such schools as represented the opinions with which they were in sympathy. Supposing we had these principles laid down, we believe the education authorities would be perfectly able to solve the problem whether they were to give the teaching themselves or merely to arrange for it to be given. It would, of course, be ridiculous that in a town all forms of religious teaching should be given in all schools. To guide the local authority it might be laid down that if there were a school within a reasonable distance where the religious teaching which a

parent demanded was given, no facilities for teaching need be given in the second school. It might be desirable to limit the minority which could claim to have its own teaching. It might very likely be desirable that in some cases external rather than internal facilities should be given. We know one village where there is a small Roman Catholic population and the children go every morning at nine o'clock to their own priest, and then go on to school to receive secular education. We do not think that we are bound to work out our proposal in any greater degree of detail.

We must, however, say something about the future of the present non-provided schools. We have recognized that in the vast majority of cases, if not in all, they ought to come under the local authority; we have objected very strongly to the employment of a large sum of money in buying them out. What ought to be done? The educational system ought to be made so fair that they will come in voluntarily. Once let it be recognized that the religious education which they were intended to preserve can be guaranteed in the future, and very few will stand out. The State will have to undertake the repairs of the buildings which are leased to them, and that amount of extra cost will fall upon the country; but if religious education is given to children as their parents desire it, and if that can be secured by Act of Parliament as the condition of the lease, then no rent should be charged. The schools will come in of their own accord. A few years will accomplish, without friction, what the proposals of the present Bill aim at by high-handed and arbitrary action.

It is necessary now to state why the Church of England is not prepared to accept what is called undenominational education. Judging from the speeches of various Non-conformists and of the present Prime Minister, it seems that the attitude of the Church of England has created a certain amount of surprise and is looked upon as most unreasonable. Now, of course, whether it appears to the promoters of this Bill as unreasonable or not is entirely beside the question. No one thinks the religious opinions of those who differ from him reasonable. The promoters

of the Inquisition thought that it was most unreasonable that anyone should object to the teaching of the Church of Rome. The very essence of religious liberty is that a man should be prepared to give liberty to people with whom he disagrees, whom he probably thinks unreasonable, of whose teaching he may strongly disapprove. It is the simple fact that the great body of the Church of England do not accept undenominational education, and therefore on any rational interpretation of the rights of conscience they have just as much claim to be heard as Roman Catholics or Jews or Nonconformists. Moreover, it is a little surprising that this position was not realized. If it were not the case, why have the members of the Church of England spent so much money in the last thirty-five years to support their schools? If they were content with undenominational education they would have surely acquiesced in Board schools everywhere. It would have saved an immense amount of trouble and would have been much more economical to the great body of subscribers. The Church of England has not changed. It has shewn its belief in its own system by subscribing a sum of money which, at a moderate estimate, amounts to forty millions. The Nonconformist has shewn his belief in his principles by taking care that his own teaching is endowed out of the rates. There has been no change in the attitude of the Church of England, except a feeling which is growing stronger and stronger that they should have fair treatment.

But it may be as well to discuss their position on its merits. In the first place it is argued by some persons, as, for example, by the Bishop of Ripon, that the Church must accept this Bill, otherwise secular education is inevitable. We entirely fail to see why, because a singularly bad Bill has been introduced, secular education, which only a small minority even of the present House of Commons would support, should in any way be likely. But, further than that, is the Bishop's contention in the least sound? Is religious education in any form likely to be promoted by a Bill which is obviously and clearly unjust? Is it not much more likely that the system suggested under the Bill

may lead to some form of secularization? For all guarantee of any religious instruction is taken away by it. And moreover the Bishop's contention appears to us entirely lacking in statesmanship. It is, in our opinion, singularly unwise for the Church of England not to stand up for its principles. A certain number of people are continually trying to force us into acquiescence by threats. We are told, for example, that if the Church of England opposes this Bill then disestablishment will be inevitable. To submit to such insolence shews a singular ignorance of political forces. If the Church of England shews that it will tamely acquiesce in the present act of spoliation, something further will be tried as rapidly as possible. If it has not the courage to fight for its convictions, if it shews no reality of belief in its own system, then the attacks begun in this Bill will be continued in other Bills. As a matter of fact, the irritation which the Bill has caused will have shewn to every far-seeing politician the extreme folly of the Liberal Government. Of course it is perfectly true that if the Church claims privileges which it will not concede to other people, if it uses its influence to oppose educational progress, then public opinion will be irritated and roused up against it. But if its claim is fair and reasonable, and if it is apparent that it is asking for nothing for itself that it would not give to others, so far from this course injuring its position it would tend to advance it; for it will shew that it has principles for which it cares. Why is it that Roman Catholics generally get what they want? Because they are true to their convictions, and their supporters in the House of Commons are equally true to them. What the Church of England has to complain of is that a small minority of its clergy and a section of its laity are either not true to its principles or unable to make up their minds what those principles are.

We must deal shortly with another objection. Some people object to certain teaching which they call sacerdotal, and seem to consider that the proper method of suppressing it is to use the State against it. It is obvious that some of those who call themselves champions of Protestantism have

been looking forward with hope to the publication of the Report of the Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, in the expectation that it will provide material to fan the flame of religious intolerance. We are glad of the strong and vigorous speech which Lord St. Aldwyn made, in which he asked why the action of a small and unimportant body of the clergy should deprive the Church of England of its rights and liberties. But what has the question of sacerdotalism or non-sacerdotalism to do with the matter? What greater right, on any principle of religious liberty or tolerance, has a Non-conformist or Protestant majority to use the State to stamp out sacerdotalism than a Roman Catholic to use the State to stamp out Protestantism? Nothing makes the injustice of the present Bill more clear than the arguments which are used in its defence. It is ridiculous to claim that undenominationalism is fair all round, when it is specially supported because it is supposed to be injurious to certain religious opinions which some people dislike. The real harm that this Bill will do is to make the sober, rational teaching of the Church of England impossible over a large area of the country. It will not touch the teaching which is usually described as sacerdotal. The majority of schools in which such teaching prevails, if it does prevail at all, are certain special schools in large towns. These will, under Clause 4, go on untouched, or almost untouched, by the present Bill, and will receive ample support from the State. It is the great mass of village schools and a large number of the town schools which are gladly attended by Nonconformists which may suffer, which will suffer.

We should have thought that the almost complete unanimity of the Church of England, that the presence together of Lord Halifax, Sir John Kennaway, the Bishops of Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, and London, would be sufficient guarantee that it was the Church and not any section that was concerned, and that the unintelligent division of religious teaching into undenominationalism and sacerdotalism which has been made is entirely unjustified. What is contended for is the right to give to the children whose parents desire it that sober, traditional

teaching of the Church of England which is contained in the Church Catechism and the Prayer-book, which looks upon the Bible as the foundation and centre of our religious knowledge, but recognizes—and all experience justifies this position—that the mass of people need the wisdom and guidance of the Christian Society to enable them rightly to comprehend the Bible. The Bible, and the Bible only, as the religion of the Protestant has never been the cry of the Church of England. How dangerous the use of the Bible unintelligently may be was shewn in another column of the *Times* newspaper which gave a report of the speech of the Prime Minister referred to above. In the judicial reports there was an account of the trial of a man who had caused the death in succession of three of his children, and claimed to support his opinions, which had prevented him from providing any proper attention for them, by the Bible. Unitarian, Protestant, Anglican, Romanist, all alike claim that their opinions represent the true teaching of the Bible. Is it, then, rational or reasonable to base the teaching of children on what must be obviously uncertain, and to leave the decision as to what a book—the interpretation of which is obviously difficult—really means to a body of excellent but uninstructed English laymen who probably know little or nothing of the languages in which that book was written, who are entirely dependent upon a translation, and who have had no training in theological opinion? It would be as sensible to say that law should be interpreted by English local authorities, or that a hospital committee should attend its patients. It is only in the realms of theology that such ridiculous proposals would be for a moment permitted.

But let us be quite clear what the teaching is which the Church of England claims. It is, as we have stated, the teaching of the Bible as interpreted by the Prayer-book, and for children especially by the Church Catechism. That teaching is definite, broad, and liberal. It is presented to the child in dignified and impressive language; it tells him little or nothing of the differences between Christians; it teaches him the great principles of religious faith and of duty; it

reminds him of his close and intimate union with his Creator, of his obligations, of his salvation : it teaches him of prayer and of sacraments in language which is accepted by every section of the English Church : not only does it not mean anything sacerdotal, it is the strongest guarantee that the Church of England has against sacerdotalism. A child brought up on the Prayer-book and the Bible may be High Church, he may be a moderate Churchman, he may be a sound Evangelical, but he is very unlikely indeed to be a disloyal Churchman. What the Church of England claims is that that sober, wise, traditional teaching in which the great majority of the nation have been educated for the last three hundred years should still go on. It only claims that it should give that teaching as part of their regular education to its own children. It does not claim or desire to impose such teaching upon a single child whose parents do not wish it to receive it. It would give exactly the same facilities to a Roman Catholic, or Jew, or Nonconformist that it claims for itself. It is prepared to pay for that teaching itself, provided the teaching be given under fair conditions, if all other religious teaching is paid for by the different religious bodies. It claims that if a portion of the rates which its members pay is to be used for teaching of which it does not approve, or which it considers inadequate, then a fair and proper proportion should also be given to teaching of which it does approve. There is nothing illogical, nothing unjust, nothing unfair in its claims.

But it is sometimes argued that because many Churchmen and Bishops have said that undenominational religious teaching is better than nothing, and because it is admitted that many of the syllabuses are very good, therefore we ought to acquiesce in them. No doubt the teaching is often good. It is given by teachers who have been trained in the Church of England training colleges, who give instruction to a great extent on a syllabus which has been largely drawn up by members of the Church of England, but here the weakness of the system suggested comes in. In some districts we can speak of it as good ; in other districts and schools we know that it is very bad and very inadequate.

It is easy to give a Unitarian bias or a Nonconformist bias, or even an irreligious bias, to the religious education. We know of instances in which the teacher has used this teaching to injure the religious beliefs of the students. But, whether it be good or bad, what right, on what principle of liberty, has any local authority to impose it as the one necessary teaching which everyone must pay for, and which is the only one given officially in the schools? The Prime Minister himself said that this was an undenominational Bill; that is an absolute confession that it is a Bill for endowing certain forms of teaching out of the rates at the expense of many persons who dislike it and consider it inadequate.

What should be the practical action to be taken at the present moment? It is quite clear that there is little chance of the Bill being defeated in the House of Commons, although it is equally clear that a considerable number of the supporters of the Government are very glad that they can throw upon the other House the onus of making the improvements which they have not the moral courage to undertake. Everything, therefore, depends upon the House of Lords. It is clearly not for us to dictate to that body what is wisest for them to do. We can only express a hope that they will approach the matter in a wise, statesmanlike spirit. It is probable, so far as we can judge from the reports which we have received from all parts of the country, that the opposition to the Bill is real and deep, and that if they are cautious and determined the House of Lords will be able very much to strengthen their position; but to do so they must be able to set before the country a sound and wise policy. We do not believe that the rejection of the Bill on the second reading would be wise. It would lead to the possibility of misrepresentation, and anyone who has been acquainted with the educational controversies of the last ten years knows how singularly astute a certain section of the community has been in drawing false trails across the scent. We remember how years ago Dr. Clifford in a London School Board election at the last moment raised an anti-Popery cry and attacked Mr. Athelstan Riley, whose action on the School Board had been thoroughly loyal to the

Church of England, for his High Church opinions. We remember how Chinese labour has been used in an entirely dishonest way as a means of supporting what are called Liberal principles. We know how responsible politicians have allowed things to be said which they were not prepared to support when they entered the House. It will be equally easy now to try to confuse the issue by combining an attack upon the House of Lords with a denunciation of sectarianism and an appeal to the people's rights as citizens—one of those fine-sounding phrases which are used by those who are prepared to sacrifice very little for their country. The House of Lords, therefore, must make it quite clear that it has a good cause to set before the country, and that cause must clearly be the rights of parents. We should therefore hope that the House of Lords will read the Bill a second time and then amend it drastically. It must be made into a just and fair measure instead of an unjust one, and that cannot be done without fundamental alteration. A clause or section of clauses must be inserted which will state that it is the business of the local authority to provide religious instruction in accordance with the wishes of the parents. Facilities under reasonable conditions must be granted in all schools. The teachers must be left perfectly free to give religious teaching if they wish, and there must be ample guarantee that no school with a trust shall be taken over unless the religious teaching which it was founded to secure is continued. There are, in fact, three principles which the House of Lords must assert: First of all, the right of the parent to have his child taught so far as is reasonable and possible in accordance with his own religious convictions; secondly, the freedom of the teacher to give religious instruction, and also his freedom to be exempt from giving teaching which he does not believe in; thirdly, the permanence of trust deeds, so long as there is a demand for the teaching which the trust was founded to secure.

As regards the action of the Church, we venture respectfully to suggest that it would be wise for our leaders to lay down a policy. It is quite easy to unite people in opposing

the present Bill, but we must also have a policy which they could unite in supporting, and that we have not received. The Archbishop of Canterbury has told us that the Liberal Government were kept fully informed of what the Church demanded. We are glad to think that they had that information, because so far as we are aware the members of the Church as a whole have never received it. We have often heard complaint made by loyal laymen that they did not know what they should support. They want to know whether they are to support the demand for Church teaching, which is easy, or whether the Church still wishes to cling to its schools, which is a difficult if not an impossible position. And surely the time has come when we should clearly state what we desire to keep and what we are prepared to give up. For our own part, we are convinced that it is essential that the Church should acquiesce in the right of the local authority to manage the schools; but, having granted that as a general principle, we should be equally clear that so far as is possible all parents who desire religious education in accordance with the principles of the Church of England for their children should be able to get it, and that if any religious teaching at all is given at the public expense that should be given. If we make these points clear, politicians will then know exactly what our position is.

As regards the bulk of the clergy, what is to be their policy in the future, supposing this Bill passes in an offensive form? Are we all to become passive resisters? Are we to acquiesce, or are we to change the Church of England into a political organization? We are quite clear that whatever happens the clergy of the Church of England should refuse to be political partisans. We do not believe that the advantages which the Nonconformists seem to have gained by their unscrupulous use of a religious organization to further the opinions of one political party will be in the long run beneficial to them. But although we do not agree that the clergy should allow the Church to become a political organization in favour of the Conservative party, we cannot help thinking that they often fail in using their influence to promote wise and sober thought on this and other ques-

tions. How many clergy use their influence to convince the people of the value of education to the interests of the country, and of the necessity of making the educational appliances strong and efficient, or to teach them the more fundamental principles of religious liberty, and to apply them to others as well as demand them for themselves? The greatest strength of the Church of England would be that it should refuse to take up a purely negative attitude. It should use all its strength in the support of education on principles of religious liberty such as we have laid down.

And generally for the country as a whole and for the Conservative party—for we have very little hope with the present House of any rational reform from the Liberal party, at any rate until it prefers national well-being to the gratification of sectarian animosity—there is a clear demand for the continuance of a wise and sober educational policy. Nothing is more necessary for the country than the promotion of education, particularly of higher education, and especially the strengthening of the university system and its independence. We need a conservative but progressive policy based on the principle not of creating new institutions to rival the old, but of encouraging and supporting and improving all the existing educational institutions, and of wisely co-ordinating their work. There will be very little difficulty at all in doing this, provided that the action is wise and statesmanlike. But, above all, throughout the whole realm of education it is essential that we should substitute for a narrow sectarian undenominationalism a true grasp of the principles of religious liberty. It is of paramount importance not only for England but also for Ireland. A university system for that country which would give an opportunity for university education in accordance with their principles to all sections of the people, and would be in accordance with popular sentiment, is the only means for restraining the spirit of religious and political partisanship. It is equally necessary in this country. We are suffering now because in the past Non-conformists were excluded from opportunities for university education, because they have been allowed to grow up a

people apart from the rest of the community. We are suffering because there is a large section of the populace who are uninfluenced by the leavening of higher education. It is recognized now that every facility should be given to Nonconformists; but that ought not to mean that Church of England teaching should be abandoned. Religious liberty will recognize both, will recognize that the duty of the State is to be fair to all sections of opinion and not to attempt the impossible task of combining by State authority people who think differently under an undenominational and unreal system of religious instruction. Wise educational progress and a true grasp of the principles of religious liberty are two essentials for the well-being of the country at the present time.

SHORT NOTICES.

I.—BIBLICAL STUDIES.

A General View of the History of the English Bible. By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D. Third Edition. Revised by WILLIAM ALDIS WRIGHT, Vice-Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. (London : Macmillan & Co. 1905.) Price 12s. 6d.

AFTER an interval of thirty-three years a third edition appears of Bishop Westcott's *History of the English Bible*. Of the merits of the work it is superfluous to speak. The distinctive interest of this issue is that it is brought out under the care of Dr. Aldis Wright, in accordance with the expressed wish of the late Bishop. To no one could the work have been more safely entrusted. 'Every statement and every quotation have been verified.' Few people realize the amount of patient labour implied by this. Particular attention has also been bestowed on the rectification of the manner of reference to authorities, so as to be consistent with chronology: e.g. 'Luther's final edition of 1541 could not have affected Tindale's of 1534 and 1535.'

Dr. Wright has contributed to this edition about a hundred supplementary notes. Some of these are slight, being additions of a date or a reference, but in every case they evince

extreme care and consummate mastery of the subject. Among the most interesting of these are the letter from Henry Bradshaw (p. 15) on the supersession of the Latin by the Wycliffite Version; the correct name of the printer of Anne Boleyn's copy of Tindale's revised edition (p. 49); the question of the King's sanctioning Coverdale's Version in 1535 (p. 63); the corrections of the *Dictionary of National Biography* (pp. 73 and 93), and that of the inscription on Whittingham's tomb at Durham (p. 90); the note on the acquisition by the British Museum of a copy of Joye's New Testament, hitherto unknown (p. 144); the bringing up to date of Bishop Westcott's notes (p. 195 and elsewhere). Interest is added in some cases by reference to rare copies of books in Dr. Wright's own possession (see pp. 67, 91, 170). Appendix IX. has many brief notices of the scholars and divines engaged on the last revision, 1870; and Appendix XII. contains entirely new matter, being a transcript of the MS. at Lambeth, giving an account of the translation of the Authorized Version, 1604.

It is singular that, in the account of the Genevan Bible, neither by Bishop Westcott nor by Dr. Wright is mention made of the suppression by Laud of two editions of this Bible, seized at the Hague. These Bibles were cheap, well printed, and easily carried in the pocket. Laud has been upbraided by some for this as a piece of tyrannical oppression, while others hold that he could not have done otherwise owing to the fanatical character of the notes. Of these some specimens are given by Bishop Westcott. They seem harmless enough, except perhaps that on the locusts in Rev. ix. 3, though by the punctuation here given it is not *all* archbishops, but those who 'forsake Christ to mainteine false doctrine,' who are so described.

There are two wrong references. On page 343, Appendix XII., p. 117 should be p. 113, and on p. 351, p. 118 should be p. 114. In a work of such extreme accuracy two such trifling misprints hardly deserve notice. So complete is our confidence in the editor that the occurrence even of these causes surprise.

Astronomy in the Old Testament. By G. SCHIAPARELLI, Director of the Brera Observatory in Milan. Authorized English Translation, with many corrections and additions by the author. (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1905.) Price 3s. 6d. net.

THIS treatise was, as the author explains in his preface, first published in Italian in 1903; in 1904 a German translation

appeared, and now the Clarendon Press has given us the work in English. Signor Schiaparelli deserves to be congratulated on a very thorough and scholarly piece of work; he is to be commended not less for the restraint which he has imposed upon himself when dealing with questions that give free play to the imagination than for the erudition and convincing argument which he has brought to bear on problem after problem. Those who are not versed in astronomy need not fear that they have anything formidable to encounter in this volume. The astronomy of the Hebrews was so superficial that a very elementary knowledge of that science is sufficient to enable one to understand the astronomical references contained in the treatise; but, though the author has been debarred from making any extensive use of his own science, he has been able to display an amazing wealth of erudition in Semitic scholarship, and not least in the fragments preserved to us of Chaldean astronomy.

The work contains a very lucid description of Hebrew cosmogony, followed by identifications of the stars mentioned in the Old Testament, and by a discussion of the Hebrew calendar, under the several heads of the day, the month, the year, and septenary periods. On several of these subjects Signor Schiaparelli has arrived at new conclusions, and in the case of the identifications of stars he seems always to have made good his case. *Ash* or *Ayish* is identified with the Hyades, *Kesil* with Orion, *Kimah* with the Pleiades—though he will have nothing to do with 'sweet influences'; the *Hadre theman* are, in his opinion, the group of brilliant stars extending from Canopus to α Centauri, *Mezarim* are the Great and Little Bear, and *Mazzaroth* or *Mazzaloth*, the star with a plural name that 'comes forth in his season,' is Hesper-Phosphor, our planet Venus. Another interesting opinion expressed by the author is that the so-called dial of Ahaz was only a staircase. Many readers will find their views of the Hebrew calendar disturbed by our author's opinion that in Old Testament times at least the beginning of the Hebrew year fell 'on the first, sometimes on the second new moon after the spring equinox,' so that the passover might fall as late as May 10; but it is not easy to be convinced that the primitive Hebrew calendar was identical with the Canaanite, as the author seems to assert, merely because some of the names of months corresponded.

There are a few points far removed from astronomy on which the author has incidentally arrived at conclusions. While

accepting the main results of the higher criticism, he adduces reasons, in our opinion hardly convincing, for dating the Book of the Covenant before Solomon and the Jubilee legislation of Leviticus xxv. after Ezra. He also shews that the Babylonians had neither a rest from business on the Sabbath day nor a week consisting regularly of seven days. The astrological week, which has given us the names of our days, was in his opinion derived from the Jewish week, not earlier than the captivity.

In conclusion it is only just to add that the translation of the work is of such a quality that, but for the title-page, the reader might have imagined that the book had been originally written in English.

An Introduction to Ecclesiastes. By A. H. McNEILE, B.D.
(Cambridge: University Press. 1904.) Price 7s. 6d. net.

THE tendency of recent criticism has been to apply to Ecclesiastes the principle of composite authorship, and in this way to account for the contradictions and abrupt changes of tone which create the chief difficulty of the book. Thus Siegfried in his *Hand-kommentar* (1898) finds, beside Koheleth himself, traces of an Epicurean Sadducee, a Hakam or 'wise man,' a Hasid or pious Jew, a Pharisee, and several other interpolators. Such minute dissection amounts to an extravagance; but Mr. McNeile has followed the clue thus given on lines of his own. He separates from the original author the handiwork of a Hakam and a Hasid; and he arrives at a result which attracts us by its simplicity and clearness, though we are not entirely convinced. In his translation he has printed the three strands of composition in different type, so that the argument becomes intelligible at once. Koheleth, after much experience of life, gives up the riddle as insoluble. He is not a pessimist, for he believes intensely that mankind could be better if circumstances were more favourable; it is the spectacle of human wrongs which moves him to despair. Nor is he a philosopher; the most he has to offer is a *modus vivendi*; the only course left open to man, with nothing to guide him, nothing to aim at, is to make the most of the present; either pleasure or industry may be recommended, but both come to the same in the end.

Obviously such a moral was not likely to find favour in religious circles, and an attempt was soon made, it is said, to improve upon the author. First came one of the 'wise men' and inserted here and there 'proverbs' of the conventional order,

in accordance with the prevailing temper of the day. These 'proverbs' can be readily detected; their frigid style is sufficient to distinguish them from the heat and sting of Koheleth's own words. But this was not enough. A pious Jew must needs attempt to supply the religious element which is so strangely lacking in Koheleth's reflections; accordingly he inserted passages designed to enforce the duty of fearing God and the certainty of Judgement. These successive annotations and criticisms secured for Ecclesiastes a place in the canon; they have not spoilt the book, but enriched it; and taking them together they form 'a three-fold cord not easily broken.' Mr. McNeile adds two valuable appendices on the character of the Greek version and the use which may be made of it for the recovery of the pre-Massoretic text. He shews successfully that the version of Koheleth now found in the LXX. was really composed by Aquila, and either superseded an older LXX. version or took the place of one, if such never existed. There is a tradition, twice mentioned by Jerome, that Aquila produced two editions of his version; Mr. McNeile accepts it, and thus explains the variations of certain groups of Greek MSS. And he applies the theory further, with much acuteness. The earlier edition was made from the Hebrew text as it existed before Rabbi Aqiba began to revise it (of course centuries before the Massoretic form of the text was stereotyped); the later edition being based upon the revised recension, under the direct influence of Aqiba. Mr. McNeile examines the evidence of the text and versions with that thoroughness and skill for which the Cambridge school is justly distinguished, and his work will be stimulating to all who are interested in the subject.

Johannine Grammar. By EDWIN A. ABBOTT, D.D. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1906.) Price 16s. 6d. net.

THE *Johannine Grammar* is in form the sixth part of the *Diatessarica*, an elaborate series of works in which their veteran author has laid all students of the New Testament under obligation by his marvellous erudition and industry, even though they may find themselves unable to agree with many of his conclusions. The penultimate volume on the *Johannine Vocabulary* and the present one are designed to be complementary, to complete and illustrate one another—so much so that the index to the former is printed here, pp. 625-651, a not altogether convenient arrangement. The object of the *Grammar* is stated

to be 'to classify with the view of ultimately explaining' the ambiguous passages, which in the *Vocabulary* are declared to be more numerous in the Fourth Gospel than in all the Three (Synoptists) taken together. 'The business of the *Grammar* will be to collect and classify these and other peculiarities so as to lead the way to an explanation that lies beyond the limits of a grammarian' (p. 6). This partially restricted aim explains, and perhaps justifies, the somewhat strange and, at first sight in a *Grammar*, disconcerting allocation of the subject-matter. The scheme of the work is strictly alphabetical, and thus 'mood,' 'participle,' and 'tense' in this order find themselves separated by long and elaborate sections on 'negative particles' and 'number,' and on 'prepositions' and 'pronouns' respectively. The method is uncompromising in its defiance of grammatical system and logic. It has, however, compensating advantages in facility of reference; and the three Indices, New Testament Passages, Subject-Matter (English), and Words (Greek) are full and accurate. The method of treatment also is modelled on the author's *Shakespearean Grammar*, of which he justly writes that, published nearly forty years ago, 'it is still found useful, since it is still in demand.'

The two books of which the main portion of Dr. Abbott's work consists, on the 'Forms and Combinations of Words,' and the 'Arrangement, Variation, and Repetition of Words,' are followed by two brief Appendices discussing certain 'sayings' and 'events' of the Gospel, in which Dr. Abbott sees a double meaning, and 'Readings of Codex Vaticanus not adopted by Westcott and Hort.' More than a hundred pages are then devoted to 'Notes on preceding Paragraphs,' and complete Indices form a fitting conclusion to a most suggestive and profitable whole. If we are not mistaken, it is to these Appendices and notes that the student will first turn as conveying more of the writer's own thoughts and judgements, ripened by nearly half a century's study of the sacred text, than was possible in the earlier part of his work, where the nature of the subject and the claims of impartial statement compelled a stricter reserve. The discussions whether of principles or of particular passages are always interesting, characterized by moderation, and served by a rich but never obtrusive learning. In particular, features of style and rhythm are well brought out which recall Semitic idiom—a subject to which the author makes reference elsewhere, especially with regard to the connective particles and in apodosis. Characteristics of this nature and the arguments founded upon

them are evidently unaffected by the numerous verbal and grammatical parallels which the papyri have recently furnished, and to which Dr. Abbott does full justice. The polemic against 'Hebraisms' in the New Testament seems to proceed largely upon a misunderstanding of what the more moderate advocates at least of such influence mean by the term. It is clear also that on a broad interpretation of the Egyptian evidence Semitic influences, even in idiom and vocabulary, are by no means excluded.

Dr. Abbott is urgent also upon the point that the form no less than the substance of the Gospel is artistic; that the writer sought to express his meaning lucidly and in order, and at least occasionally to supplement and interpret the Synoptic narrative. 'We certainly must suppose that the author of this Gospel had an unusually keen sense of rhythm and dramatic fitness. It may also well be that in the course—perhaps a very long course—of oral teaching, his Gospel assumed a shape in which no phrase or word has been set down except as the result of artistic as well as spiritual evolution' (p. 421). That witness is surely true. The more clearly it is understood that the Gospels, Synoptic as well as Johannine, are not the expressions of the passing mood of the writers, jotted down *currente calamo*, but the outcome of serious thought, of prolonged and purposeful intent, the more confidence will justly be felt, after all allowance has been made for the accidents that may have overtaken them in the course of transmission to our own day, in the honesty and reliability of their testimony, and in the genuineness and authentic nature of the teaching which their authors convey.

Many comments and expositions of interest have been noted in the course of reading this volume, to which it would have been pleasant to call attention. The limits of a review will allow of reference to but one or two. Dr. Abbott is always suggestive, even where his conclusions will not command universal assent. 'Iva seems always to retain some notion or suggestion of purpose or motive as being the essence of action' (p. 114), and is therefore never used of evil to be avoided, or with verbs of 'forbidding' &c.; nor is it ever merely oppositional. The Johannine use of the perfect where the aorist or present might have been expected is probably to be explained 'as a modification of the LXX. rendering of the Hebrew perfect in cases where it implies persistence' (p. 325). These and other positions are maintained and illustrated with a minute discussion, which is always open and fair-minded, of each and all of the

passages concerned. For the difficult text of i. 18 Dr. Abbott advocates a punctuation which the present reviewer has for many years held to be the true one, placing a comma after *μονογενής*, and explaining that 'the Logos here receives three distinct titles' (p. 42); compare Is. ix. 6, a passage which perhaps was in the writer's mind.

It must, however, be repeated that of so elaborate a work, crowded with detail, a just conception and appreciation can only be obtained by prolonged use and study. The author has given forth the ripe fruit of many years' labour, and the result is a *corpus* of illustrative and expository material with which no serious student of the Fourth Gospel, or indeed of the New Testament as a whole, will be able to dispense.

St. John and the End of the Apostolic Age. By the ABBÉ CONSTANT FOUARD. Authorized Translation. (New York and London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1905.) Price 7s. 6d.

THE lamented death of the Abbé Constant Fouard on the eve of the publication of this volume, which completes the series of histories on 'The Beginnings of the Church,' lends it a pathetic interest. The work is popular in character, and contains a sketch of the history and an analysis of the documents. The authenticity of the Johannine writings is briefly vindicated in the Introduction, the chief stress being laid on the evidence of Irenæus. The treatment of the Apocalypse is not very helpful. The commentary in the main followed is that of Bossuet. The angels of the churches are the bishops, and Timothy, as bishop of Ephesus, is portrayed as having 'yielded to the promptings of his easy-going nature' (p. 93). The Gospel is held to be the product of the Alexandrian philosophy, and to be Alexandrian in form, 'presenting the Saviour's work under an allegorical form, as a struggle between Light and Darkness' (p. 177). St. John was led to adopt this method by his long sojourn in Ephesus.

The whole book is of course written from the Roman standpoint. The Epistle of Clement 'forms really the first in the long series of Papal Bulls' (p. 137). The last chapter of St. John's Gospel was added by the Apostle to guard against the error of looking upon him as the chief pastor of Christendom (p. 200). The Jews, who refused to the Apocrypha a place in their canon of Scripture, were 'without the guidance of the Spirit, which had enlightened the synagogue of old.'

In the power of the second beast (Rev. xiii. 18) is foretold 'the sovereign sway . . . which in our own day impious sects exercise over laws and governments' (p. 113).

Turning to the historical side of the book, there is little recognition of recent work. The sketch of Jewish events is well done, but in writing of the Jewish Christian Church the early manner of speaking of the Holy Ghost as 'my mother, the Holy Spirit,' is described as 'wild imaginings,' in apparent ignorance of the fact that this form of expression existed also in the Syriac Church. Nero is held guilty of the fire of Rome, and the persecutions in his reign and Domitian's are spoken of as the first and second persecutions; it is supposed that peace prevailed in the interval.

In the last chapter the Gnostic heresy is briefly mentioned and condemned, but with a true recognition of the value of the work of the Gnostic teachers which is worth quoting:

'Egypt, that bore them, cherished both their influence and its esteem for them. The Fathers must needs reckon with them in their philosophical works, and highly too. Clement of Alexandria speaks of them with the greatest respect; he quotes one of their disciples, Heracleon, as one of the authorities. He and Origen take from them all which seemed compatible with the teaching of the Christian Church. Under their influence the city of Alexandria became one of the most brilliant centres of theology' (p. 239).

The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ. By R. J. KNOWLING, D.D.
(London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1905.) Price 10s. 6d. net.

CANON KNOWLING publishes under this title three series of Boyle Lectures (1903-5) on St. Paul's writings. In the first series he deals mainly with the question of the authenticity of the documents, devoting one lecture to the consideration of the Book of the Acts. In the second series he treats of the relation between the Epistles and the Gospels. In the third series he deals with the place of St. Paul's life and teaching in the history of the first half-century of the Christian Church. As we expect from Canon Knowling, the book shews a very wide, perhaps an exhaustive, acquaintance with contemporary criticism; it is marked by conspicuous fairness in dealing with divergent views; and presents the reader with the materials for forming his own judgement. The plan of the work makes a certain amount of repetition inevitable, and the mass of material brought under review is not always lightly handled. It is sometimes difficult to

see the wood for the trees. The reader would have been greatly helped by a chronological list of early authorities, without which, indeed, we venture to say, no book of this character ought to be published. So much of the argument necessarily depends on the approximate dating of early authorities that a writer on these subjects ought to shew clearly, and in a form for easy reference, what results he regards as determined and what as doubtful in the chronology of second-century literature. An introductory chapter devoted to this subject and a chronological table would probably have saved space and would certainly have conduced to clearness. Another desideratum is a bibliographical list of the modern authors who are cited. Such a list would certainly have been a work of some labour, but it would have borne remarkable testimony to the range of the author's reading and have been of considerable use to the student.

In the first series, Dr. Knowling, as we have said, examines the question of the authenticity of the Epistles attributed to St. Paul. He comes to the conclusion that the grounds for recognizing the Pauline authorship are in all cases sufficiently established. Perhaps the most valuable part of his treatment is the evidence he produces of the reaction which has taken place in the so-called advanced criticism from the extreme positions which have from time to time been advocated. A considerable amount of space is devoted to what is perhaps the most curious effort of criticism in this department, the attack of Van Manen on the four central Epistles. It is indeed difficult to persuade the English student that such an attack could be made seriously. But as it has been made in a form accessible to all, it was no doubt worth while to meet it. The treatment of the more widely disputed Epistles, especially the Ephesians and the Pastoral Epistles, is full and judicious. As regards the Ephesians, we should like to have seen a development of Dr. Hort's profound suggestion that, from the point of view of the full statement of St. Paul's doctrine, the Epistle to the Romans necessarily requires the Epistle to the Ephesians: the latter carries on and completes the argument of the former in developing the idea that the Christian Church is the new Israel. We would suggest also that light might be thrown on the relation between the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians by the analogy of the relation between the Epistles to the Galatians and the Romans, and perhaps also, though less obviously, by the relation between the two Epistles to Timothy. In each of the two former pairs

of writings we have an elaborate positive exposition of great doctrinal positions related by close verbal and material resemblances to a more controversial and occasional treatment of the same theme. In the two Epistles to Timothy we have a not dissimilar conjunction of what is, on the whole, an official deliverance on matters of pastoral practice with a more private and personal treatment of the same subject. Such a similarity of relations may be thought to be an argument for the authenticity of the more disputable documents which is not to be neglected.

The case of the Pastoral Epistles is naturally more strongly put by an attack upon the suppositions alternative to that of authenticity. We should have liked to see a more complete treatment of the view that much of these Epistles belongs to the same date as the Epistle of Clement and the Ignatian Epistles. The question of priority in the verbal echoes might have been worked out more fully. And the curious complexity of the inter-relations of the three Epistles might have claimed consideration. On the other hand, some excellent things are said as to the improbability that such a treatment of heresies and church order as the Epistles give is the work of a later writer; and the argument from the references to persons is admirably put.

In the second series of lectures, forming chapters ix. to xvi., Canon Knowling gives us perhaps the most valuable result of his labours. After an interesting discussion of the narrative and conditions of the Conversion of St. Paul (on which he establishes a strong case against various critics), and a sensible and penetrating discussion of the principles of comparison between the Epistles and the Gospels, and the sources upon which St. Paul may be reasonably presumed to have drawn, he gives a detailed examination of the Epistles in succession, in their bearing upon the facts of the Lord's life on earth, the interpretation of His Person and functions, and the references to His teaching and example. He deals in particular with the evidence that St. Paul drew upon the character of Jesus for his own moral exhortations, so astonishing in their freshness and originality; and he brings out with great force the dependence upon the facts as preserved in the Gospels of his teaching on the Holy Eucharist, the Kingdom, the Moral Law, and the great facts of the Lord's birth, death, resurrection, and ascension. These chapters are full of suggestive detail which will repay the student for careful and thorough study. He will, indeed, wish for such help as might have been given by initial or marginal analyses; in a word, by plainer indications of the

systematic treatment which is in fact applied to the subject. He will perhaps weary a little of the constant note of controversy. But that is incidental to the plan of the book, and perhaps unavoidable, and to some extent useful. The interpretations of particular passages and of the drift of teaching and arguments are on the whole so sound that we are surprised at the very doubtful interpretation of Rom. vi. 17, which the author gives in two places, and the more than disputable translation of 2 Tim. i. 13 (p. 348). We call particular attention to one line of argument which is frequently overlooked, and which Canon Knowling uses effectively and discreetly. Facts as to the life and character of the Lord are used by St. Paul to enforce special conclusions, in the main for Christian imitation, though frequently also for elucidation of doctrine. The fact that there is this definite object in the established references forestalls all deductions, which are frequently drawn, as to supposed limitations of St. Paul's knowledge. This argument is sound and important.

In the third series of lectures, we have a careful and interesting account of St. Paul's missionary activity, the principles on which he worked, his relation to contemporary conditions, both among Jews and Gentiles, and his attitude towards the fundamental conditions of social and political life. The treatment of the relation between Christianity and the religious movements of the time is sensible and fair. Emphasis is rightly laid on the critical importance of differences, in all such comparisons. We expect common elements in all religious movements; the distinctive characteristics are the decisive criteria of connection. There are, further, some interesting pages on the application of St. Paul's principles of missionary work to modern conditions in India and Japan. We should have wished, if space had allowed, to have given a more exhaustive review of this work. But enough has been perhaps said to shew that it is an important and interesting contribution to the treatment of the beginnings of Christianity.

The Epistles of St. Peter. By J. H. JOWETT, M.A. (London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1905.) Price 5s.

BEYOND the fact that this volume is one of the series called the 'Devotional and Practical Commentary,' there is no preface or note to guide the reader. The text is that of the Revised Version with a certain number of the marginal renderings introduced. The exegesis is weak; grace is considered only in the

VOL. LXII.—NO. CXXIV.

G G

Pauline sense ; the rite of baptism is treated as purely external, and St. Peter is said to speak of a baptism of inspiration ; while in too many cases little attempt is made to set forth St. Peter's thought, and leading ideas and subjects are dwelt upon from quite a different standpoint. This standpoint is throughout that of the individualistic piety which characterizes Nonconformity. The first Epistle of St. Peter suffers peculiarly from such treatment, owing to the very large measure in which it is based upon Old Testament thought and language.

There is a significant passage (p. 288) in which Mr. Jowett says :

'I do not know anything which is more needed in our Free Church life and worship than an awed and reverent consciousness of God. . . . I sometimes think that our very detachment from any prescribed order of service, our boundless freedom, our familiarity with the Lord, our easy intimacy of communion need to be guarded from besetting perils.'

This only makes us regret the more some of the expressions, and the exaggerated language, in which Mr. Jowett indulges, and which mar otherwise good work.

St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things. By H. A. A. KENNEDY, M.A., D.Sc. (London : Hodder and Stoughton. 1904.) Price 7s. 6d. net.

THIS is a valuable monograph on one side, and, as is justly argued, the most important side, of Pauline theology. Such monographs have in the past become almost a monopoly of German theologians, and we can heartily welcome a work written by one of our own countrymen, who has read widely and brought sober and reverent criticism to bear upon the work of his predecessors in this field. Dr. Kennedy is best known to many scholars by his useful little work on the *Sources of New Testament Greek*.¹ We are glad that he has now turned his attention and scholarship from the study of New Testament language to that of New Testament doctrine, and has given us the fruit of his ripe learning in these Cunningham Lectures for 1904.

In his opening chapter the author shews how eschatology lies at the root of the Apostle's thoughts ; we find an eschatological bias present in his two fundamental conceptions of justification and the new life in the Spirit. At the same time we are reminded that he has no cut-and-dried eschatological system, that the subject is treated in a fragmentary way, and that we must not expect to find

¹ T. and T. Clark, 1895.

answers to all questions that are asked at the present day. Then follows a valuable chapter on the Formative Influences in St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things. The influences considered are (1) the Old Testament; (2) Judaism, that is to say, the Apocalyptic literature and the rabbinical doctrines; (3) St. Paul's conversion and Christian experiences; (4) the traditional eschatology of Christ. The points most clearly brought out in the book are the dependence of the Apostle on the Old Testament, his dependence on the teaching of Christ, through whatever channel that teaching may have reached him, and, above all, his indebtedness to his own personal experiences. 'It is not too much, we believe, to assert that St. Paul has rediscovered the Old Testament for himself as a Christian' (p. 46). In tracing the Old Testament element in the Apostle's eschatology the writer follows the wise guidance of the late Dr. A. B. Davidson, to whose class lectures he acknowledges himself deeply indebted. The growth of the belief in a resurrection is traced from Old Testament times, when eschatology concerned the nation as a whole and the departed Israelite passed a shadowy existence in Sheol, to the gradual emergence of the doctrine of a resurrection of the individual, at first of only the pious few, while later we have indications of a universal resurrection. The Millennium, it is interesting to note, 'is in its origin due to the attempt to harmonize the earlier and the later groups of ideas. It is . . . a compromise between the ancient hope of the prophets, which belongs to this world, and the modern, Jewish, transcendental hope' (p. 74). Chapter iii. is an important one, in which the meaning attached by St. Paul to the terms 'life' and 'death' is carefully considered. Life is to him, as to the Old Testament writers, *existence in touch with God*, fulness of life in the Divine favour; no distinction is drawn between moral and physical death. The converse of life, ἀπώλεια, is not 'destruction' or 'annihilation,' but the 'utter ruin' of one who is cut off from communion with God. The following chapters treat at length of St. Paul's conceptions of the Parousia and the Judgement, the Resurrection, the consummation of the Kingdom of God, and an additional note deals with his relation to Hellenism.

We cannot enter at length into Dr. Kennedy's discussion of these topics. Suffice it to say that the subject is always handled with freshness and originality, and there is a wholesome dread of basing theories on insufficient data. Indeed, we are rather inclined to think that the author errs a little on the side of caution; we are loth entirely to give up some of the theories that have been put forward in connexion with the subject, and which are here subjected to a searching criticism. We think that rather more might be said

on the other side in some instances. Thus, the author disbelieves in the theory of a gradual development in the Apostle's eschatology. With regard to the picture of the End given in 1 and 2 Thessalonians, he suggests that

'the Macedonians were a simple people, and St. Paul finds it fitting to set the events of the end before them by the help of impressive imagery. Probably in this direction, rather than in that of a development of the Apostle's views, we may look for an explanation of the diversity in his presentation of eschatological conceptions.'¹

This is an interesting suggestion; yet we cannot but think that 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians xv., and 2 Corinthians v. do, indeed, mark three stages in the Apostle's progression from a more material to a more spiritual conception of the End. Similarly, with regard to St. Paul's conversion, the writer is opposed to the belief which has recently gained ground in any 'psychological preparation of Saul the Pharisee,' any preliminary struggle (the 'kicking against the pricks') gradually inclining him towards Christianity. But here again we meet with an interesting suggestion, namely, that St. Paul's conception of the resurrection body arose out of reflection on the appearance of his Lord on the road to Damascus (p. 89). Again, the writer will not allow that in 1 Cor. xv. 23, 24 (ἀπαρχὴ Χριστός, ἔπειτα οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . εἶτα τὸ τέλος) there is any hint of a Millennium (p. 322). But surely instances like Mk. iv. 28 (πρῶτον χόρτον, εἶτα στάχυν, εἶτα πλήρη σίτον) or 1 Tim. ii. 13 (Ἀδὰμ γὰρ πρῶτος ἐπλάσθη, εἶτα Εὐὰ), or in this very chapter of 1 Corinthians xv. 5 (ὥφθη Κηφᾶ, εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα) and 7 (ἔπειτα ὥφθη Ἰακώβω, εἶτα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων . . . καμοὶ) do presuppose an interval of time between the preceding clause and that introduced by εἶτα. With greater justice, perhaps, the writer impugns the theory of Hellenic or Hellenistic influence on St. Paul's conceptions (p. 346 ff.).

The footnotes appended to the lectures shew wide reading and a just estimate of the worth of many rash theories of German theologians. Persian eschatology is frequently drawn on for parallels. The slight objection may be raised that notes on one and the same subject are sometimes scattered over different parts of the book.

The Last Things. By JOSEPH AGAR BEET, D.D. (London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1905.) Price 6s.

THIS book is a 'new edition, revised throughout and in part rewritten,' of a work published in 1897, in which the respected

¹ P. 50: cf. pp. 163, 263.

author maintained that the doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul is not taught in Holy Scripture, and that the punishment of the wicked may end in their loss of conscious existence. It was withdrawn at the instance of friends who feared that it might compromise the Wesleyan College at Richmond in which the author was a professor; but the more striking part of it appeared in *The Immortality of the Soul: a Protest*, which was noticed in these pages in April 1902. By resigning his office Dr. Beet has gained liberty to reissue his book. We should indeed be sorry to suppose that so reverent and modest a study was censured by our Wesleyan brethren; but office may put a restriction on personal liberty.

Those who are familiar with Dr. Beet's works will expect, and they will find, a careful, sober, and candid examination of most of the scriptural passages which deal expressly with the Last Things. We think he does not give sufficient weight to such passages as speak of a final submission of all things to Christ and God; and we are surprised that there is no reference at all to our Lord's account of 'eternal life' (John xvii. 3), by which the meaning of 'eternal' in other contexts is regulated. But we chiefly regret that he almost restricts himself to such a study of particular texts as is inspired by the grammar and the dictionary, hardly considering the light which is thrown on his subject by the general knowledge of God given to us in Jesus Christ. Does the conclusion to which he inclines form a consistent and worthy epilogue to a Revelation which declares the creation of all things in the Word, the faithful love of God for His fallen creatures, the provision for their restoration by the Incarnation, the outpouring of the Almighty Spirit? Can the final sequel of these marvels be the persistent alienation and the ultimate extinction of a portion of the world which God thus loves?

A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John. By J. B. JOHNSON, M.A. (London: Skeffington. 1904.) Price 7s. 6d. net.

THE brief preface to this work states that its object 'is to indicate what seems to be the true principle of interpretation, namely, to read the Book as a revelation of manifold aspects of the Catholic Church in every age, and also of manifold aspects of the spiritual life.' The writer is thus a follower of earlier commentators, such as Arethas, finding mystical meanings of universal application for the imagery of the Apocalypse, and rejecting the views of modern writers,

'who have fruitlessly sought for the fulfilment of these Divine visions in secular history.' The book is, indeed, a return to the style of patristic commentary. It is written in a deeply reverent spirit, and shews signs of wide reading of the early commentators. Arethas and Ludovicus Alcazar, the sixteenth-century commentator, are the authors most frequently cited, but no mention is made of any more recent writer. There is no introduction, dealing with such important matters as authorship, canonicity, and the history of the Book. The attitude of the writer to the 'higher criticism' is seen in his stricture on a dignitary of the Church for suggesting that St. John 'borrowed' his imagery from Ezekiel (p. 13). Any occurrence of numbers in the text is the occasion for mystical interpretations after the manner of Philo or Origen. It must be added that the author's scholarship is not irreproachable. Even the grammatical peculiarities of the Apocalypse will hardly justify his substitution of 'by Thy will' for the A.V. translation of *διὰ τὸ θέλημα σου*, 'for Thy pleasure' (p. 46); and the meanings which he constantly draws from the use of the aorist (or timeless tense, as he explains it) are entirely fanciful. The work may have a certain value for devotional reading, but, considered as a serious contribution to exegesis, it must be pronounced to be distinctly retrograde and of slight value.

The Book of the Revelation. By C. ANDERSON SCOTT, M.A.
(London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1905.) Price 5s.

WE are grateful to Mr. Scott for this volume, which presents in convenient form the results of much recent work. The limits of the volume have prevented attention being given to the devotional aspect of the Book, but at the present time so much advance has been made in understanding the historical and literary background that it is necessary to give a good deal of space to this more introductory side of the subject. Nor has the editor altogether neglected the practical application of the large principles of Divine government with which the Book deals. The first half of the volume is given to the letters to the seven churches, and naturally Professor Ramsay's work has been largely drawn upon. We believe that the angel of each church is rightly explained as the heavenly counterpart of the church, but we regret his subsequent identification with 'the invisible church' (p. 61); nor is this quite consistent with what Mr. Scott rightly observes, that the angel is 'identified with his church as partaker of its character and also of its destiny' (p. 43).

Mr. Scott incidentally calls attention to small points which tend to convince him of the Johannine authorship (*e.g.* Rev. xxii. 8, *cf.* 1 John i. 1-3); but he thinks that in three passages St. John has gone beyond his usual practice of drawing upon the language of Old Testament writers and of Jewish Apocalypses, and has actually incorporated considerable passages from the latter. These are the opening sections of cc. vii. xi. and xii. Chapter xii. confessedly presents one of the most difficult problems of the Book, and Mr. Scott notes the chief points. There is probably a long history behind the form of this vision, of which we can only catch an occasional glimpse.

II.—CHURCH HISTORY.

India and the Apostle Thomas. By A. E. MEDLYCOTT, Bishop of Tricomia. (London: Nutt. 1905.) Price 10s. 6d. net.

It is difficult to know where to begin in a notice of Bishop Medlycott's defence of the historical reality of St. Thomas' martyrdom at Mylapore, a suburb of Madras. To the author, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Tricomia, the work has been obviously a labour of love. But his ideas of what constitutes valid historical evidence, or of what makes a narrative credible, are very different from those usually held by serious investigators. For instance, he says (p. 148, note): 'The tradition that the Apostles, by some supernatural intervention, received intimation to assemble at the dwelling of the Blessed Virgin, Mother of Jesus, before her demise, is, like other sound ecclesiastical traditions, based on a solid foundation.' And then he proceeds to quote his authorities, the earliest of which is St. Gregory of Tours, A.D. 590. Such evidence will hardly convince any one who does not already accept the story on ecclesiastical authority.

This dictum of Bishop Medlycott's is brought forward here because it is characteristic of the arbitrary manner in which he treats his historical sources. If he likes what they tell him, he believes them; if he dislikes them, he holds himself free to disbelieve. On pp. 255, 256, he tells the story of St. Thomas and the cup-bearer—how an attendant at the bridal feast of the king's daughter struck Thomas, and how Thomas foretold his imminent punishment; the man who was a cup-bearer was presently killed by a wild beast when he went to fetch water; dogs tore the body to pieces, and one of them brought into the banquet the right arm which had struck the Apostle. All were amazed at the occurrence, and the king urged Thomas

to come into the bridal chamber and bless the new couple. This story is found in all known forms of the 'Acts of Thomas'—Syriac, Greek, and Latin—and it is commented upon by St. Augustine. St. Augustine did not approve of the story, nor does Bishop Medlycott. But one is scarcely prepared for his solution. He says (p. 256) :

'The great Doctor of the Church considers the part attributed to the Apostle unbecoming and savouring of revenge ; we may therefore dismiss the detail in the form it is presented by the text. But suppose the Apostle, when smitten on the cheek, in place of resenting it with a tinge of revenge, offered the other meekly to his assailant, not forgetful of his Master's counsel, would this not as well have promoted a general movement in his favour among the assembly ?'

It is impossible not to sympathize with so kind and amiable a personality as Bishop Medlycott thus shews himself to be, but we must confess that the author of the 'Acts of Thomas' has a sounder sense of dramatic propriety.

What Bishop Medlycott has failed to grasp is that all the Church 'tradition' about St. Thomas is based on the 'Acts of Thomas' and on the 'Acts of Thomas' alone. Pseudo-Abdias, the Latin *Passio*, the Latin *De Miraculis*, all are forms of the 'Acts of Thomas,' that striking Syriac Romance, the fullest form of which is the one edited by Wright.¹ And until Bishop Medlycott allowed free play to his somewhat excessive scepticism it had not been doubted that the Acts we know were what the Lady Egeria (ci-devant Silvia) had read to her at Edessa. We are wiser now : according to Bishop Medlycott, Egeria and her friends, being Catholics, 'these would not be the distorted Gnostic edition that has come down to us, but a copy of the Acts accepted and recognised as catholic and genuine by the Christians of that age' (p. 111). And he goes on to say : 'This [*i.e.* our author's absolutely baseless conjecture] offers clear proof that there were copies which had not been distorted and utilized for Gnostic purposes, as we find is the case with those that have come down to us.'²

The real question is therefore whether there be any historical

¹ The most ancient and primitive form now extant is doubtless that preserved in the palimpsest leaves at Sinai (see p. 222).

² In the next sentence Bishop Medlycott tells us that the Codex of the Scriptures carried by the Pilgrims was in Greek, 'as shown from her quotations.' How does he explain the use of *colloca* for *κατοικιστον* by the Pilgrim in quoting Gen. xlvii. 6?

element in the 'Acts of Thomas.' It cannot be said that Bishop Medlycott has succeeded in making the tale more credible. The only tangible evidence is that the Gundaphar of the Acts may be identified with Gumdaphara, an Indo-Bactrian king, whose coins are met with in the neighbourhood of Peshawar. The date might fit with an Apostle's activity, but the place suited rather the 'tradition' that St. Thomas preached to the Parthians than to the inhabitants of the Madras Presidency! And if it be allowable to argue from the name Gundaphar that the 'Acts of Thomas' is historical, it is equally allowable to argue from the name of King Mazdai that they are unhistorical. Mazdai, like Gundaphar, is known to the Western world through coins, but he lived in the times of Alexander the Great and died as Satrap of Babylon. If it be permitted, on the authority of coins, to take St. Thomas against tradition into Afghanistan, the same authority might bring down the age of Mazdai into the Christian era. The fact is that we do not know what would seem to a Mesopotamian writer of the third century A.D. to be natural names to give to kings of 'India.' Because the names appear to a Roman Catholic bishop of the twentieth century strange and unfamiliar, that is no reason why they should be equally strange to a Syriac-speaking Christian of the third century.

The origin of the cult of the bones of St. Thomas at Edessa is a matter about which we have little means for investigation. All that can be said with certainty is that about the middle of the fourth century it was believed that Edessa possessed the bones of the Apostle, and that they had been brought to the city from 'India' by a merchant. The festival kept in St. Thomas' honour was July 3, the anniversary of the arrival of the Relics in Edessa. This is natural enough. What is not natural, notwithstanding Bishop Medlycott's explanations, is that July 3 was the festival of St. Thomas kept at Mylapore, the place where the Bishop believes St. Thomas to have been martyred and buried (p. 79). Bishop Medlycott says that the clergy of every rite invariably carry with them their own ritual and calendar wherever they go, so that the fact of July 3 being kept as the feast of St. Thomas at Mylapore only tells us that the clergy were of the Syrian rite. Yes, that is so; but if the clergy at Mylapore in the early Middle Ages were a Syriac mission from Edessa, how can one maintain the continuity of the historical tradition that Mylapore was the place where the martyrdom really took place?

It is sincerely to be hoped that Bishop Medlycott's book is

not the first stage of a process whereby the martyrdom of St. Thomas at Mylapore is to be officially accepted by our Roman brethren as an authenticated fact. In the 'Acts of Judas Thomas' we possess one of the most characteristic monuments of the great Syriac-speaking branch of the early Church. The eloquence and the zeal of the unknown author of these Apocryphal Acts are alike admirable, although they carry him often beyond the bounds of a sane orthodoxy. But to make the narrative framework of his romance into serious history, is to lay a yoke upon the neck of the faithful that neither Tillemont nor the singular caution of Pope Gelasius was able to bear.

History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria.

(Part II. : Peter I. to Benjamin I.) Being Tom. I, Fasc. 4, of *Patrologia Orientalis*. Arabic text and translation by B. EVETTS. (Paris: Firmin-Didot. 1905.) Price 8 fr. 35.

THE second instalment of Severus' history now given by Mr. Evetts extends from 300 to 661 A.D., or more strictly to January 662—the actual month in which the great Benjamin died. It is a period of remarkable importance for the Church of Egypt, covering the persecutions of Diocletian, Valens, and Valentinian, the long patriarchate of Athanasius, the Arian controversy, the overthrow of paganism, and the final severance of the Copts at Chalcedon from the Eastern Communion; while in political history we trace the decline and fall of the Roman dominion, first broken in the early seventh century by the short-lived Persian occupation of Egypt, restored by the heroic Heraclius, then once for all ended by the Arab conquest.

Speaking generally, one must pronounce this section of Severus' work somewhat disappointing to students. It does not seem to throw new light of importance on the broader aspects of the history, whether ecclesiastical or political. Take away all that Renaudot has made known, and the interest of the remainder is centred mostly in details, though some of these have a significance which in part escaped Renaudot's notice, and in part results from more recent research. We do not, therefore, propose to deal in this review with subjects like the Arian, or Nestorian, or even the Monophysite controversy, although one must express surprise and regret that, while there are tolerably full accounts of the Councils of Niceæ, Constantinople, and Ephesus, the Council of Chalcedon, with all its momentous consequences for the Coptic Church, is passed over

in almost total silence. This Severus explains by saying that Mennas indeed wrote of what Dioscorus suffered at Chalcedon : ' But at that time the creeds were separated, and the sees were torn asunder, so that none was left to write histories of the patriarchs, and the custom of writing them was interrupted. . . . In this way no biography of the patriarch Dioscorus after his banishment has been found.' No doubt the confusion and persecution which followed Chalcedon distracted the Church ; but it is strange that Severus should know no authentic story of the schism which rent the Christendom of the East. One hoped to discover fresh evidence upon the real significance of that passionate protest against Chalcedon which sounds through all Coptic history ; and the absence of any such record here is to be deplored. One may note, however, that the newly-published *Synaxarium* in the same series (*Patr. Orient.* t. I, fasc. 3) does give under 7 Thoth a short biography of Dioscorus and an account of Chalcedon.

Mention has been made in a former review¹ of the discrepancies in Severus's chronology, or the chronology loosely built upon his data. On this point Renaudot has some just strictures ; but it is puzzling to find Mr. Evetts dating, for example, Timothy I. from 380-385 A.D. at the heading of the very paragraph in his translation in which Timothy is made to sit on the throne for nine and a half years ; and by the Arabic text the translation is correct (pp. 425-6). The first specific year-date in this text is 242 of Diocletian (p. 457), so that no doubt all earlier dates are more or less inferential. But, again, on p. 483, the heading makes Anastasius die in 616 A.D., while the text dates his death 22 Kihak 330 Diocl., which falls in December 613. Mr. Evetts will doubtless deal with these and the like questions in his commentary. Their difficulty is great ; but recent writers have cleared the way for a more consistent chronology. Schwartz, for example, has shewn how the writings of Athanasius may be used to correct the chronology of the Church historians.

Severus makes it quite clear—though Renaudot denies the fact—that the name *Theodosian people* was applied to the whole Coptic community, and that it is derived from the patriarch Theodosius, whose long defiance of Justinian's threats and cajoleries alike made him the idol of his flock. A fact of singular interest comes out in his history—that one of the emperor's offers was to unite in the person of Theodosius the civil governor-

¹ *C.Q.R.*, vol. lx., July 1905, p. 431.

ship of Alexandria and the archbishopric. Such a union was actually effected in the case of Cyrus by Heraclius, as is now generally admitted; and this piece of evidence shews that what Heraclius accomplished Justinian at least contemplated, and that the idea of a prince-bishop was not unfamiliar in the sixth and seventh centuries. It was during this same conflict of Justinian with Theodosius that the custom began of appointing a Melkite or Imperial patriarch for Egypt from Constantinople, and the whole biography is well worth reading as at least a faithful exposition of Coptic religious sentiment.

The historical value of Severus' narrative is diminished by his love of legend and the totally uncritical spirit in which he deals with his materials. Still, there are points of ritual, ecclesiology, and topography on which he gives incidentally information of value, as when he tells us that at Cyril's enthronement in 412 A.D. the bishops raised the Four Gospels over his head; or in the details of the consecration of the church of St. Macarius at Wadi Natrûn, where not only the walls and columns, but also the dome and the altar-board are named as anointed with chrism. What, too, could be better than Athanasius' pronouncement on the limits of fasting (p. 405)? The tomb of St. Mark is mentioned several times, and that it existed in 300 A.D. is undoubted; indeed, Severus alleges that the tomb was left uninjured when the church was burned at the Arab conquest.

In regard to the famous Ennaton Monastery we make a discovery of real importance. Scholars have been perplexed by the various names assigned to it; but it is now clear that the very term *Ennaton Monastery* is a misnomer, and that the Ennaton was really a great group of monasteries, each with its own dedication or popular name. One was called the convent of Az Zajâj, or The Glass-blower; another was called after Mount Tabor; and another was dedicated to St. Joseph. Indeed, so great was the number that Severus in two places (pp. 472, 485) speaks of the monasteries as six hundred; and they were all Coptic. It is no longer in doubt that these Ennaton monasteries were those which the Persians sacked and destroyed at the siege of Alexandria in the early seventh century, though the destruction cannot have been so complete as Severus represents it, because we hear of the Ennaton in later history. In his account of this Persian invasion¹ Dr. A. J. Butler rightly places

¹ *Arab Conquest of Egypt*, p. 74.

the Persian camp on the west of Alexandria, but he distinguishes between the Ennaton and the destroyed convents—a conclusion which must now be modified. On the other hand, his contention that the church of the Angelion was in the precincts of the Serapeum is placed beyond doubt. It will be remembered that the Angelion was built upon the site of St. Mark's martyrdom; and Severus here says that this church stood by the 105 steps which were at the eastern end of the Serapeum. The church, however, was not built till the middle of the sixth century. The church of SS. Cosmas and Damian, which is always closely associated with the Angelion, is vaguely described as lying 'east of the *melâb* and a little west of the colonnade'; but whether *melâb* means *amphitheatre* (as Mr. Evetts translates) or *theatre*, or merely *playground*, is doubtful. What is certain is that it cannot possibly refer to the hippodrome.

Of the destruction of the Serapeum under Theophilus Severus tells us nothing except that seven days after the death of Athanasius 'the door of the temple was blocked up'—a story which Renaudot rightly discredits. One would have thought that the details of the fall of Serapis and the old paganism would be found imperishably graven in Coptic history; but here, as so often, events of revolutionary importance are passed in silence, while wearisome squabbles on jots and tittles of orthodoxy or heresy are preserved. So with the great secular movements of the seventh century. Something there is of the Persian invasion, something of the Arab conquest, but how short and how confused is the story! The account of both events has already been criticized and utilized by Dr. Butler in the work referred to. He has, for example, denied the truth of Severus' statement that Heraclius ever paid tribute to the Muslims in respect of Egypt; but the publication of this text now makes it doubtful whether Severus ever intended to convey that meaning. Mr. Evetts so arranges the English paragraphs as to convey it, but there are no breaks in the Arabic, and the sense might well be that after the Saracen capture of Damascus and Syria Heraclius, while collecting the Roman forces from Egypt, paid tribute to the Muslims to stay their progress in Syria. Neither version of the story, however, can be believed. In the passage relating to the actual fighting in Egypt Mr. Evetts is not justified in altering *Arianus*, the reading given by all the MSS., to *Marianus*, which is a fiction of later writers. The true name, as Dr. Butler has shewn, is *Arction*, which Arab copyists easily

corrupted into *Artabân*, and *Arianus*. Mr. Evetts so far accepts Dr. Butler's theory of the identity of Al Mukaukas as to translate boldly *the Colchian*. No doubt that theory has been accepted by Continental and by Egyptian scholars; but the term *Mukaukas* is so well consecrated by usage that one would prefer to see it retained, whatever its origin. On p. 487 the unknown Dair Kibrius is by a most ingenious conjecture made into *Dair Canopus*. The objection is that there does not seem any analogy for calling any Dair after an adjacent town.

Other small points may be noted in the translation. On p. 414 we question the rendering of *Timi* by *Thmuïs*, the Arabic form for which is generally *Tamúyah*. *Gospels* on p. 461 should be *gospel*, and in the same line the Arabic does not warrant the idea that the emperor's portrait seal was *attached* to his decree; the suggestion is rather that an ink impression from a stamp was used. On p. 465 the Arabic *jalas* is wrongly rendered by *knelt*, a sense the word never seems to bear, and for *relics* one should read *body*. The patriarch 'received a blessing from the body of St. Mark and sat down by it' is the true sense, and there is a real difference of usage in question. The word *synthronus*, on p. 400, may lie under the Arabic form in the text, but it is hardly a recognized term for the throne in the apse of a Coptic church. On p. 462, in the expression 'civil patriarchate,' the word 'civil' has crept in by inadvertence, and *Pharao* (p. 437) and *Thodosius* (p. 466) are obvious misprints.

But Mr. Evetts' work, as a whole, is careful and conscientious, and this, his second contribution to the new *Patrologia*, is worthy of his repute as an eminent Arabic scholar. We only wish it had been possible for him to publish his commentary on the history of Severus *pari passu* with the text and translation.

III.—ARCHÆOLOGY AND ANTIQUITIES.

Archæology and False Antiquities. By ROBERT MUNRO, M.A., M.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E., F.S.A. Scot. 'The Antiquary's Books.' (London: Methuen and Co. 1905.) Price 7s. 6d.

DEMAND, we are taught, produces supply; and certain it is that when collectors, a fickle and changeable race, set their affections upon any particular class of antique objects, the forger presses close upon the heels of the vendor of authentic specimens. Thus china, glass, bronzes, jewels, ivories, miniatures, pictures, furniture, and many other objects, are skilfully constructed to imitate

and be sold for and at the price of the curiosities which they pretend to be. Some time ago a learned judge is said to have been much puzzled when a witness described his occupation in life as that of a 'wormer'—in other words, a man who earned his living by making and filling sham worm-holes in what purported to be ancient furniture.

When archæologists began to take an interest in stone implements the inevitable forger came on the scene, and it is said that there are few of our museums which do not contain samples of his industry masquerading as genuine examples of the work of prehistoric man. Of course it is not difficult, given the possession of some dexterity and patience, to make admirable replicas of arrow-heads, celts, and other well-known types of stone implements. Apart from forgeries made 'with intent to deceive,' the imitations of Mr. Henry Balfour, the keeper of the Pitt-Rivers Museum at Oxford, and of Snare of Brandon, where the ancient trade of flint-knapping still goes on as it has gone on for who shall say how many centuries, are well known to all palæthnologists. The instruments with which these imitations are made are simple enough, though, of course, vastly superior to those possessed by the original makers of flint weapons and tools. 'Flint Jack,' whose fame is widespread, and whose life and works are described in the book under review, used an old bradawl or some other simple fragment of iron for the fabrication of the objects with which he deceived so many of the elect. He commenced as a legitimate searcher for antiquities, which he sold to those collectors who had more money than time; but, finding that the making of imitations was a much more rapid way to gain than the tedious and uncertain process of searching for the real things, he in time came to devote himself entirely to the making of forgeries and, if he had not taken to drink and squandered all his earnings, might have amassed quite a comfortable little independence. He has had a number of later followers, including the ingenious constructors of palæoliths described by Mr. Worthington Smith in his interesting book, *Man, the Primæval Savage*.

Greed of gain has, naturally, been a common cause for the fabrication of false antiquities—no doubt the commonest cause. But it has not been the *only* cause, for they seem also to have been made from the desire to gain notoriety, from the wish to play a trick upon some excavator, and from other reasons.

To set out information on this curious chapter in the history of human fraud and human credulity would appear, from the

title, to be the object of Dr. Munro's book; but, as a matter of fact, more than half of its pages are devoted to a minute account of the controversy which has raged for some years around certain pile buildings—possibly crannogs—which have been discovered along the Clyde, and the objects which have been found in the course of their excavation. We are rather disposed to quarrel with the distinguished author for devoting so much of his space to a subject of far less interest to most of his readers than the subject of forged antiquities, as to the methods of diagnosing which we should like to be, but are not, informed. We would seriously ask the author to consider whether a large part of this section of the book would not have found a more fitting home in the pages of a pamphlet than in those of a volume forming part of a series which should consist of serious and permanent additions to our present knowledge. We also venture to doubt whether it is really seemly, in a scientific discussion, to ask your opponent, himself an antiquary of some eminence, 'to discard the weapons of misquotation and misstatement of facts' (p. 164), to say that his mind is 'impervious to legitimate argument' (p. 167), or to describe his arguments as 'fatuous' (p. 187). Amenities of this kind should be discarded as relics of the Bentley and Porson age, unworthy of the present century. A short account of these curious discoveries, the importance of which Dr. Munro, as a Scot, is perhaps a little prone to overrate, would have had its interest, and the discussion as to the art of the late Celtic period and its date, to which they lead up, would certainly have been valuable; but too much space, we cannot but think, has been allotted to this antiquarian squabble.

The earlier, and shorter part of the book commences with certain Prolegomena in which we find once more set down as definite and proved statements of fact the surmises of men of science as to the history and development of the human race. We do not quarrel with these as surmises, but we do protest against its being set down as an established fact that the attainment of the erect posture was the cause of the development of man's intellect, a most remarkable hypothesis, unsustained by a single fact. We cannot agree that 'the crowd of new ideas, and the more complex train of reasoning which ensued from the thoughtful efforts of our earlier predecessors as toolmakers, soon led to the invention of spoken language;' for such an assumption necessitates the belief that the abstract idea of a spoken language was in the mind before the concrete product was in existence—surely an unsustainable thesis. To these and some other

views we are bound to take exception, and would recommend the author to lay to heart the words of Epicharmus, which he himself quotes, 'that the very nerves and sinews of knowledge consist in believing nothing rashly.'

Turning now to the part of the book which deals with false antiquities, we find, besides the account of 'Flint Jack,' to which allusion has already been made, descriptions of the finding of the 'Moulin-Quignon jaw,' around which so much controversy once raged; of the Meillet forgeries, the Breonio finds, and of the relics which were at one time supposed to have proved the existence of Tertiary man in North America, amongst which the most important is the once-famed Calaveras skull, enshrined in verse by the late Mr. Bret Harte. Some of these objects were deliberate falsifications, like those of 'Flint Jack'; others seem to have originated in a desire for fame; others, though not belonging to the remote period at first claimed for them, were only false in the conclusions drawn from them, not in the intentions of their discoverers or makers. The Calaveras skull and the pestles and mortars, to which so much importance was once attached, were discovered before observers had learnt the lesson that objects of comparatively recent, or even of quite recent, date may be found at times in strata which would seem to argue for them an extreme antiquity. Sometimes it is impossible to tell how they have attained their position; at other times it seems certain, or probable, that they have slipped through cracks in the earth or fallen down the burrowed track of some animal, or even through the pipes occasionally formed in the earth by the decomposition of the roots of trees dead long ago. In any case, it is clear that the greatest suspicion must always attach to any object discovered in unlikely surroundings until it has been proved—so far as such a thing can be proved—that it was deposited there at the same time that the strata amongst which it lies were deposited, and not long subsequently. The history of the skulls, claimed to have been the earliest relics of man, is very instructive in this respect, for any person who follows the accounts of these objects given in succeeding years cannot fail to be struck by the fact that the extreme antiquity originally claimed for some of them has been refused by later observers, and that some men of science, high in reputation, have considered as quite recent remains which others, of equal merit, have believed to be of hoary age. The history of the controversy respecting the Neanderthal skull is an excellent example of this kind of thing.

VOL. LXII.—NO. CXXIV.

H H

A further lesson, which hardly needs to be mentioned to any who have themselves worked in the field, but which cannot be too much impressed upon beginners, as it is by Dr. Munro, is that the accounts of workmen as to the exact position in which any object has been found must always be taken with even more than a grain of salt. Much misleading information has found its way into archaeological literature because this fundamental rule has been neglected.

Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie. Publié par le R. P. dom Fernand Cabrol, Bénédictin de Solesmes, Prieur de Farnborough (Angleterre). Avec le concours d'un grand nombre de Collaborateurs. Fascicule I. *AN—Accusations contre les Chrétiens.* Fascicule II. *Accusations contre les Chrétiens—Afrique.* (Paris : Letouzey et Ané, Éditeurs. 1903.) Price 5 fr. each.

It is always difficult to review an encyclopædia or a dictionary ; it is still more difficult to do so when, from whatever cause, the duty has been neglected, and a sense of shortcoming is added to the inevitable feeling of incompetency which the most learned writer must experience when he is asked to give his opinion on a series of articles covering the widest range of knowledge.

The enterprise undertaken by the Benedictine community of Farnborough is projected on a scale worthy of the great Benedictine works of the eighteenth century. It is to embrace not only antiquities and archaeology, properly so called, but also, and in a particular way, liturgies. Under the first heading its contents are summed up as follows :

'Les Antiquités et l'Archéologie, c'est à dire les institutions anciennes, les mœurs et les coutumes des âges primitifs, l'architecture ancienne dans ses rapports avec la liturgie et l'art chrétien de la première époque, l'iconographie, les symboles et les figures, l'épigraphie, la paléographie, la sigillographie, la numismatique, dans leurs relations avec l'antiquité chrétienne. Cette étude sera menée environ jusqu'à l'époque de Charlemagne. Nous laisserons donc de côté les institutions d'âge postérieur, comme les Universités, dont l'histoire appartient davantage à la philosophie et à la théologie, les ordres monastiques postérieurs au X^e siècle, les assemblées du clergé de France, etc.'

Under the head of Liturgies are to be included : *Les formules, les livres liturgiques, les gestes, les choses et éléments, les familles*

liturgiques, les personnes, la liturgie des morts, le culte, le temps, and le chant liturgique.

When we read this programme, and still more when we see the length of some of the articles, we wonder whether the enterprise undertaken is not too great to be accomplished even by a monastic community. It demands not only that corporate immortality which has been possible for a society like that of the Bollandists, but also an ample command of funds, and there will be always the difficulty which attends any enterprise of this kind—that by the time the later volumes of the series are reached the earlier are out of date. A dictionary is not the best place for the best work which is apt to be buried in it. It might be very much better if the dictionary were to be short, concise, and full of references, and that the admirable work of some of its contributors should be published in reasoned monographs. It is a disadvantage of the dictionary that good work and bad appear side by side.

When we turn to the *fascicules* which we have before us, we notice at once the excellence of the work that it contains in the department of archæology. The article on *Abercius* is very full and complete, and so are all the other articles which bear the same signature—H. Leclercq. Shortly afterwards we have a similar thorough piece of work on *Abrasax*, and then one on *Abréviations*. In the second *fascicule* he writes on *Acolyte* and *Actes des Martyrs*. We are afraid that the volumes must proceed somewhat slowly if so much work has to come from one contributor. Less satisfactory seems to us the article on *Achaia*. There is a want of geographical precision about it quite unjustifiable after the works of Mommsen and Marquardt on the provinces. In no conceivable circumstances should Thessalonica have a place in such an article. We want in the first place an accurate definition of the meaning of *Achaia* at different epochs, and then we want such things as a list of bishops and bishops' sees. A dictionary such as this should do for all the provinces of the Empire the sort of work that Ramsay has done for Asia Minor. On the other hand, when we pass to archæology, where Dom Leclercq is on his own ground, the article appears to be very full.

Dom Cabrol himself does the liturgical articles *ΑΩ*, *Abraham*, *Absolutions*, *Ablutions*, *Acclamations*. The article on *Abbaye* is by Dom J. M. Besse, who also does *Abbé* and *Abbesse*. M. Paul

H H 2

Allard writes on *Abdon et Sennen*, and there is a long article on the musical accent by Dom Gatard.

We do not profess to be able to follow all the writers each on his own ground. The learning in all cases is undeniable. The industry is superb. We have the greatest goodwill towards this vigorous movement of Benedictine learning connected with Farnborough, and the new dictionary will give what cannot be got elsewhere. But we must own that we wish so many important articles did not appear over a single signature, although that signature represents a very learned and in many directions competent writer.

A Guide to the Early Christian and Byzantine Antiquities, with Fifteen Plates and Eighty-four Illustrations. Printed by order of the Trustees of the British Museum. Price 1s.

THIS is just the book which had long been needed. It is comprehensive and it is cheap, it is scholarly and it is popular. This is, of course, only what we expect from the guides issued by the Trustees of the British Museum, and the excellent catalogue of the Christian Antiquities, by Mr. Dalton, was a guarantee that the smaller guide, when it appeared, would not fall below the high level of the other handbooks. The illustrations are numerous and good, while the matter has the directness and lucidity which come from thorough knowledge of a subject. Again and again we find sentences which in a few lines sum up the results of long and patient study.

English students who read no language but their own have long been at a disadvantage in studying Christian Archæology. This was, it is true, somewhat removed by the appearance of Mr. Lowrie's book in the series of *Handbooks of Archaeology and Antiquities*, published by Messrs. Macmillan; but the British Museum Guide, though not, of course, so full, has the advantage of being cheaper, and of depending for its illustrations on examples which can be studied by those who cannot afford to travel.

For it is practically a manual of Christian Antiquities. Mr. Dalton was obliged, in writing the catalogue, to confine himself to describing the objects in the Museum, but in the guide he has taken the opportunity of writing several chapters containing the general information needed to understand them, and the collection, though small, gives occasion to speak of nearly every branch of the subject. He writes of the catacombs, of early symbolism, of syncretism, of the forms of the earliest churches, of Byzantine art, of gilded glasses

and ivories, and there is much interesting information about the Greek, Coptic and Abyssinian Churches. A study of inscriptions and a history of the mosaics of the fourth and following centuries are the only important subjects which have been, perforce, left out.

Such work is specially welcome since, owing to the neglect of the study in England, we are somewhat in danger as historians of forming an exaggerated picture of the early Church. We rely chiefly on the writings of the Fathers, which represent, no doubt, the typical and best side of Church life, though of recent years the study of liturgies and Church Orders has enabled us to call up a better picture of the average level of its official presentation. These two sides are, of course, those best worth studying; but still, the Christianity of the mass of the people can only be understood from the remains of their monuments and their art; and archaeological study has a special value in correcting a tendency to idealize the past, and in making us understand and realize a people who were, after all, not so very different from ourselves.

There is nothing like a visit to the catacombs of Rome to bring this home to us, and the paintings preserved in them are among the most important pieces of evidence that we have of the life of the Christian people in the earliest times. The chief thing that strikes us in considering the symbols and symbolic scenes which appear in them (as also on lamps and rings, and, in later times, on sarcophagi and gilded glasses), is that they are very limited, even narrow, in their range of subject. Popular Christianity seems to have been extraordinarily simple and almost entirely unliterary. The whole cycle suggests but few ideas—deliverance from the world, the protection of Christ, immortality, the power of prayer. The life of the people centred round the Sacraments of the Church, to symbolize which each image is used in turn. In the Biblical scenes which occur, it is this side which is prominent. The Baptism of our Lord (which, by the way, putting aside the three scenes in the cemetery of Callistus, where opinion is divided as to whether it be not a catechumen who is represented, certainly does occur in the cemetery of SS. Petrus and Marcellinus before the time of Constantine), is pictured as men were accustomed to see the rite performed, without any attempt at historical imagination. Even in the painting of the Breaking of Bread in the Capella Græca in the cemetery of Priscilla, it would seem to be the action of the bishop that is copied, and the symbolic feast that suggested the arrangement, rather than any idea of the upper room at Jerusalem.

Mr. Dalton suggests that scenes of melancholy and terror were avoided in times of persecution, when it was the aim of the Church

to encourage and strengthen the community. For this reason, he suggests, pictures of the Crucifixion and of the Last Judgement were avoided. Certainly this hopeful and serene attitude does seem to have marked the lives of the Christian people. The vindictiveness which is the leading motive of later Judgement scenes, such as those of Michel Angelo or Rubens, was, one hopes, left to orators like Tertullian to give point to their perorations, or to the compilers of heretical allegories, where Jewish or Greek tradition was strong. It has often been remarked that the account of the martyrdoms of Lyons and Vienne are entirely free from anger against the persecutors, and the similar freedom of popular art from dwelling on the injuries done to the Church could surely not have been due entirely to æsthetic traditions. But in the case of the Last Judgement, which is first found in the Barbarini terra cotta, dating perhaps from the fifth or sixth century, the reason seems rather to be that the idea as we know it was not there. Each separate element is met with; the judgement of the individual, the crowning of the victor, and, later, the separation of good and evil in the parable of the sheep and the goats, or of the wise and foolish virgins, the triumph of Christ and the Apocalyptic Judgement (in the great mosaics of the basilicas) all appear, but the fusion of these several ideas does not seem to have taken place, at any rate in the popular mind as reflected in art, till theology had received the stamp of Roman organizing genius, and the Benedictines of Reichenau and S. Angelo in Formis gave it expression in the manner common to the cathedrals of the Middle Ages and the hymn of Thomas of Celano.

It is often asserted that the early Christians borrowed largely from Paganism. Sometimes it is declared that in the ages of persecution the ceremonies of the Church were copied from those of the Mysteries; sometimes this paganizing of the faith is put down to the conversion of Constantine. That there was some such fusion among the people is shewn by the large number of gnostic gems which have been found, and the celebrated casket of Projecta in the British Museum is a proof that there were semi-pagans after the peace of the Church. But there is no real fusion in art. The gnostic symbols remain things by themselves, and fourth-century Christian art continued its own development practically uninfluenced by classic tradition. It would seem more probable, therefore, that among the masses of the people the living faith and the dying superstition existed indeed side by side, but never fused.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the guide is the section which deals with the difficult question of Byzantine Antiquities. A vast quantity of information is compressed into a dozen pages, and a

clear outline is given of Byzantine art in its origin, in its three chief periods, and in its influence on the West. Its close connection with the Eastern Empire is shewn; its debt to Persia and Syria, the loss caused by the iconoclastic spirit, and the gain due to the enforced return to earlier models, the Renaissance under the Macedonian dynasty and the last phase under the Palæologi, are all pointed out. The error of the popular interpretation of 'Byzantine' as equivalent to monotonous and debased is made clear. So far from the influence of the East being towards barbarism, it was the artistic genius of the Greeks that never died out among the people whose life is revealed in art. It resisted the influx of Asiatic fashions in the first ages of Constantinople, and, borrowing fresh methods from the East, it created a new Christian art; it developed the Syro-Egyptian architecture, and perfected it in the cathedral of St. Sophia; new elements were borrowed from Egypt and Arabia by the Greek silk weavers of Sicily, and Greek artists, driven from their own land by the iconoclasts, influenced the revival of mosaic work at Rome, and painted the walls of Sta. Maria Antiqua; the Renaissance under Charlemagne was based in part on the study of Byzantine models; Byzantine artists gave the Western world enamel work in the ninth century, and the bronze doors imported from Constantinople in the tenth suggested the production of similar work by Western craftsmen; Constantinople was the mother of Russian art, and all through the early Middle Ages Greek influence was felt in Italy, till it became lost in the glorious outburst of the Florentine Renaissance, which it had stimulated, just as to Greek literature may be traced the intellectual revival of learning. The debt of Western Christendom to the Greek people is one in philosophy, theology and art.

Celtic Art in Pagan and Christian Times. By J. ROMILLY ALLEN, F.S.A. With numerous illustrations. 'The Antiquary's Books.' (London: Methuen and Co.) Price 7s. 6d. net.

No one is better qualified to treat of Celtic Art than is Mr. J. Romilly Allen. His present work includes the whole subject, from the most recent discoveries of primitive works at Hallstatt, thirty miles S.E. of Salzburg in Austria, and at La Tène, at the N.E. end of the Lake of Neuchâtel, to what we know of Celtic art in Great Britain and Ireland at the time of the Norman Conquest. The Hallstatt finds shew very clearly the transition from the Bronze to the Iron Age in Central Europe, while those of La Tène exhibit the modified and later form of the Hallstatt culture as it existed in Central Europe from about 400 B.C. It is perhaps hardly necessary to remark that

when we speak of the Bronze Age we do not mean that the use of bronze did not extend into the Iron Age, but that bronze was the ordinary material for weapons and other articles that were afterwards commonly made of iron and steel. Each 'age' overlapped the age that followed. Stone was gradually superseded by bronze, as bronze was by iron. Nevertheless, bronze continued to be used along with iron for such things as it was best adapted for, such as sword handles and sheaths, after the blades had come to be made of iron, and not of bronze as before. And in this way bronze was in common use in England all through the Celtic period and for much longer. Bronze cannon, indeed, were in common use in Europe until about the time of the Peninsular War, after which many of those that were taken were converted into church bells—a modern application of the principle of beating swords into ploughshares and spears into pruning-hooks.

In a book covering so long a period as does the volume before us, and one about which so much may be said, we must not expect any very detailed treatment. As regards the Christian portion of the subject, which will interest many of our readers more than the Pagan, the work by the same author on *Christian Symbolism* (London, 1887) furnishes much information which could not be given in his recent work. Here, however, we have a most serviceable book of reference on the whole subject, Pagan and Christian, shewing how the latter arose out of the former, in the natural and ordinary course of things. The first Christian grave-stones were 'rude stone monuments' such as had been set up in Pagan times, but bearing Christian devices and inscriptions. As time went on, these sculptured blocks developed into such monuments as the noble 'High Crosses' in Ireland and elsewhere. The characteristic forms of ornament, so far as the Christian period is concerned, appear first in the MSS., such as the Lindisfarne Gospels, the Book of Kells, &c., from which they were copied in stone, bronze and other metals, leather and other materials. The miscalled 'Runic' knotwork is one of the most characteristic patterns, but it is found also in marble side-posts and in perforated marble screen work in Rome itself, as well as in Roman tessellated pavements in England and elsewhere. It has been called 'Runic' from its purely accidental association with runes on some Saxon and Scandinavian sculptured stones. In the book under notice we have lists of all the best known examples of MSS., crosses, bells, shrines, &c., as well as references to authoritative works, and we can heartily recommend it as a most convenient guide to the whole subject, and one which will afford a good general notion, and much incidental information, to such as have not leisure or inclina-

tion to pursue the matter into fuller detail than could have been given in the space at the author's command.

One of the many interesting points illustrated by Celtic monuments is the way in which they illustrate the history of the Church. We know, of course, that while England was Pagan-Saxon, Christianity was spreading rapidly from Gaul into Cornwall, Wales, and S.W. Scotland, and thence to Ireland. Then, soon after the coming of Augustine, there was a return-wave from Ireland to Iona, and from Iona to Lindisfarne and Northumbria. Accordingly, the XP monogram is found in Cornwall, Wales, and Wigtownshire, but not the cross with expanded ends in a circle, which is a later development of the XP monogram. The latter, however, is found in Ireland, but not the XP. Then the monuments which are Celtic in character abound most in the North, where the Iona influence was most felt. This is a specimen of the kind of points that are made in the book under review, and which make it well worthy of the attention of all who are interested in the history of our Church.

IV.—ADDRESSES AND SERMONS.

English Churchmanship. An Invitation to Brotherly Union on the Basis of the Book of Common Prayer. Being the Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter delivered at his Primary Visitation. By ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON, D.D., LL.D., Bishop. (London: S.P.C.K. 1905.) Price 6d.

THE Bishop of Exeter's excellent charge suggests many thoughts. The first is as regards a visitation.

'The ancient law of the Church was that "every year the bishop must visit every diocese and all his parishes, going through and around, and exercising supervision." He was to visit every church; or, "if he cannot conveniently or without difficulty find access to each, let him be careful to convene clergy and laity from several places to one convenient centre, that the visitation of these places be not delayed."'

The purpose of his visitation was defined to be 'to correct and reform the churches, to consecrate churches, and to sow the Word of Life in the Lord's field.'

We need not pursue the history which the Bishop gives of the manner in which this ideal was broken down. How the one year became three years, and what was the exception became the rule, so that now the bishop does not visit his diocese, but summons his diocese to visit him. We note the reasons which are given for such a visitation not being necessary. That

confirmations are held at other times, that the rural deans visit the churches—many of them never do so—that the bishop is always hurrying about his diocese—that is, unfortunately, quite true. None of these reasons seems to us to be at all an adequate substitute for the old rule. May we venture respectfully to suggest that the old plan should be returned to? That once in three years the bishop should solemnly visit in person every church in his diocese. That he should personally inspect and inquire into everything which concerns the well-being of the church, that he should perform every episcopal function—should baptize adults, should confirm, should reconcile to the Church, should consecrate new churches, should if necessary hold a solemn visitation-court. The visit should be arranged so far as possible a year beforehand. It should not be a hurried one. The bishop should celebrate in the parish church, and preach at a service so arranged that everyone could attend it. He should make a careful inquiry into all the church property, settle disputes, regulate the ritual of the parish, become acquainted with all the leading laymen, friendly or otherwise, and if possible the Nonconformists, especially their ministers. We are quite certain that if he were to do this there would be very few ritual difficulties and very few clerical scandals.

But it will be said, he would never have time. The reason alleged would be, in the first place, the size of the dioceses. That we need hardly say only emphasizes the necessity for an increase of the Episcopate. The second reason that would be given is that the bishop has so much else to do. We would answer that what we would desire is that he should *not* do a large number of these things. He is more and more ceasing to be an overseer and becoming a member of the rank and file. The last idea, that of the motor-car bishop, seems to us just the worst of all. There is to our mind something essentially unepiscopal in a service conducted between two trains, and in the idea that we want from the bishops three unthought addresses in a day, instead of one thought-out one. The work of the Catholic Church does not require the methods suitable to commercial enterprise, the motive of which is 'Get rich quick.' We believe that a single dignified, leisurely pastoral visit to a church, a parish or a town, would have infinitely more influence than the present hurried work.

We have made the Bishop of Exeter's charge a text for preaching a sermon. The subject which it discusses we must reserve for full consideration at a later date.

The Grace of Episcopacy and other Sermons. By H. C. BEECHING, D.Litt., Canon of Westminster. (London: James Nisbet and Co. 1905.) Price 3s. 6d. net.

ALL the sermons and addresses in this little volume fully sustain the author's reputation for chastened beauty of expression and sobriety of thought. The most important is undoubtedly the sermon which is placed first, and gives the title to the book. It was preached at the consecration of the Bishops of Carlisle and Burnley, and without raising controversy, is conceived in the true spirit of primitive episcopacy. The independent position of the preacher adds greatly to the force of his reflections on current difficulties. His warning against a false view of the solidarity of the episcopate, which tends to merge the independence of the individual bishop in the vote of the majority, is timely and by no means unnecessary. And, in view of the almost military idea of clerical obedience, which is freely urged in quarters not usually favourable to sacerdotalism, it is well that we should be reminded that sympathetic influence, rather than the word of command, is the true method of the Christian pastor. Without any pedantry of patristic reference, the sermon constantly recalls the best thoughts of Cyprian and Ignatius. Dr. Beeching is perhaps less convincing in his apology for the religious freedom of Westminster Abbey. Is it not perilous, for example, to justify the omission of the minatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed on the ground that scholars are now agreed that the concluding verses of the second Gospel are not Marcan? Do we reject Hebrews because it is not Pauline? Must we accept the Johannine authorship of the whole of the Fourth Gospel before every part can be quoted as Scripture? Passing to the rest of the book, there is scarcely a page which does not bear witness to a keen, sympathetic, and sometimes humorous outlook upon life; and, if the spirit is not exactly that of the prophet, the mind is that of Christ. English literature is laid under generous contribution to illustrate the subject in hand, not quoted conventionally from a somewhat meagre stock, as the manner of some is. Since Ainger left us, the type of preaching here exemplified is none too common, and such collections are to be welcomed accordingly.

The Bible and Christian Life. By WALTER LOCK, D.D., Warden of Keble College. (London: Methuen and Co. 1905.) Price 6s. 'THE sense of Scripture is Scripture,' said Waterland, and the effect of this collection of papers is to fix the mind on the ideas

rather than the words, the whole rather than the parts, of the Bible, and to establish its claim to be inspired on the inspiration which the sacred writings in their totality convey to human life. The sermons and lectures here gathered together, though delivered on occasions unconnected with one another, exemplify a method of Biblical study based on sound historical principles, rational, but not rationalistic. Two of the lectures and one or two of the sermons deal specially with the Old Testament, while the rest carry us mainly along those lines of inquiry which Dr. Lock has made his own. But there is an absence of technicality and academic pedantry, which should make the volume fruitful in suggestion for the parish pulpit. It is not so much that the reader is introduced to many of the best results of modern research, though this is true; but that it is scarcely possible to read these pages without acquiring an attitude towards Scripture at once saner and more reverent than is still too frequently found. Dr. Lock is impressed with the need of ministering to that historic imagination which alone can quicken the words of prophet or apostle. So to view them as the living expression of principles as true to-day as when first uttered 'cannot,' as the author justly observes, 'take the place of learning:.'

'It is no doubt very easy to use a few spiritual truths to hide ignorance of details; like an undergraduate hurrying on his surplice to hide the deficiencies of his toilet in chapel; but, after all, however complete the dress may be underneath, the surplice is needed to give it grace and to fit him for that place.'

V.—GENERAL LITERATURE.

Personal Studies. By HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral. (London: Wells Gardner, Darton and Co. 1905.) Price 6s.

THESE studies will make the reader envy the lot of those who are fortunate enough to be numbered among the writer's friends. For them the 'fresh terror added to death,' by that biographer of the Lord Chancellors of England, Lord Campbell, does not exist. They know that if they are notable people, and it falls to the lot of Canon Scott Holland to paint their portraits after their death, there will be nothing merciless or repellent in those portraits, but that they will glow with the light of endearing attractiveness or commanding nobility. Dr. Holland is a great

master of his art. His vivid touch brings his subjects throbbing with life before our eyes. He shews us their very thoughts, aspirations, actions, ablaze with the glory of noble enthusiasm, of devout worship, of faithful service. Such special power of portraiture is a rare gift, and marks the single-minded artist, who alone retains the instinct which avoids strained attitudes, jarring notes, false tones, and thus produces a harmonious portrait.

If the reader would see four such examples of types of spiritual beauty sketched with exquisite tenderness, let him turn to the chapters on Queen Victoria, Jenny Lind, Bishop Westcott, and Robert Campbell Moberly. The Queen's portrait is very beautiful, full of pathos and fervent loyalty. In speaking of the 'incomparable feat she had achieved,' the writer gives this key to her power :

'Work was her first secret, and her second was a yet more simple and unexpected device ; it was the device of being good, of relying on the force of moral goodness. Here was the girl's originality ; for license is the commonplace of thrones. The daring and original stroke lay in recognizing that goodness was not merely a tribute to decency, but a governing force.'

He sees the same spiritual beauty in the great singer. The inspiration which made the writer include the moving description of her visit to look the last on the face of her dead friend Mrs. Nassau Senior must make all mourners profoundly grateful to him. He gives the description in Jenny Lind's own words :

'It was not her *own* look that was in her face. It was the look of another, the face of another, that had passed into hers. It was the shadow of Christ that had come upon her. She had seen Christ . . . and I said, "Let me see this thing. Let me stop here always. . . . Where are my children ? Let them come and see. Here is a woman who has seen Christ."'

And he adds : 'I can never forget the dramatic intensity of her manner as she told me all this, and how she at last had to drag herself away, as from a vision.'

Side by side with these two portraits of noble women we place the description of Bishop Westcott, of the prophetic, of the martyr-spirit ; of his mysticism 'beginning with exactitude of mathematical numbers and geometric measures, and from these, finding the platform from which to make its leap into infinitude' ; of his tender pity which transformed the Prince-Bishop's deer park into 'a resting home for exhausted pit

ponies,' and of his mission as a prophet of Hope. And if we add the chapter on Canon Moberly, a man 'whose life was rooted in the ancient pieties of discipline, reserve, submission, meekness,' we find ourselves gazing at a group painted with the tender grace of a Fra Angelico.

But it was the strong reed pen of an Albert Dürer which drew Mr. Gladstone, Archbishop Temple, and Father Dolling. Eight words perfectly describe the mission of the devoted priest, whose house was 'the moral hospital, the spiritual home of convalescence.' And not less true is the description of Archbishop Temple of 'heroic mould with a heart of human tenderness,' with 'a devouring hunger for righteousness,' 'the real passion of religion; his whole being could flame through and through with spiritual emotion.' Of the three chapters on Mr. Gladstone, that on his religion is of the deepest interest. Incidentally it gives us, on pages 53 and 55, a valuable definition of the position of the Church of England and of her place in God's provision for human needs. The chapter on Gladstone and Ruskin sparkles with Canon Scott Holland's contagious fun, which also delights us in his review of Mr. Johnston's *Life of Liddon*. Who but he would have dared to describe that memorable walk of the great theologian escorting 'the Duchess' safely home from Hinksey meadow! It peeps out at us in fifty places in the book; for a spirit of joyous eagerness pervades all the studies, except those of Lord Salisbury, Bishop Stubbs, and Cecil Rhodes, over which heavy sadness broods.

The writer's eloquent description on page 245 of Lord Acton as historian and politician, and his discriminating judgements on the historical work of Bishop Creighton and Bishop Stubbs bear witness to his veneration for the office and work of the historian; whilst he glorifies the artist by comparing the two great movements of religion and art in the chapters on Sir Edward Burne-Jones, Dean Church, and the Mission of the Oxford Movement. 'The spirit of brotherhood was in the air, through the influence of the Catholic Revival. Everywhere men were feeling after the joy of mediæval fraternities.' He traces the fiery chivalry of the champions of the Church, the poets of the *Lyra Apostolica*, to the source of its inspiration, the desire for 'Authority, discipline, mystery;' and he shews how these motives were ruling forces with the great Pre-Raphaelite painter.

It is curious that a writer of such instinctive sympathies should complain on pages 213 and 257, in the reviews of Mrs.

Creighton's and Lady Burne-Jones' biographies, that both biographers omit to 'tell the inner process of change' in their husbands' religious convictions. We should have thought that he would have been one of the first to perceive that such revelations would, if lawful, be impossible to be made by a wife. From the nature of her intimacy, her mind, permeated by her husband's influence, would be unable to register the points and degrees of his spiritual temperature. No healthy-minded man can keep a chart of his soul's progress; and his wife ought not to be able to do so for him.

We have only had space to speak of the character-painting of these men of action, which to us is the great charm of this book. Other writers tell us what these men and women did. Canon Scott Holland tells us what they were; and why they should be enrolled with honour on the list of England's Worthies.

Leaders of the Church, 1800-1900. Edited by GEORGE W. E. RUSSELL. *Bishop Wilberforce.* By REGINALD G. WILBERFORCE. (London: Mowbray. 1905.) Price 3s. 6d. net.

In a general preface the editor of this new series of biographies boldly challenges a lofty standard of expectation. 'The Leaders of the Church' for an entire century are, under his guidance, to be handled with an 'attractiveness and interest' which is deemed unattainable by or incompatible with a technical or professional spirit, and the sacred enclosure is consequently to be strictly reserved for laymen. There is perhaps something quaint in the 'prepossession,' or may we venture to call it prejudice, thus enunciated. It has at any rate the charm of novelty, and may engender imitation. We look for the advertisement of biographies of men of science with the note that no scientist has been allowed to write one of them.

To pass from the general scheme to the volume before us, we have to thank Mr. Wilberforce for a very charming picture. Samuel of Oxford started in life with the rare advantage of having a father, who amidst the engrossing cares of his splendid and laborious work, devoted infinite trouble to the training of his sons, and fostered with unwearied pains Samuel's inherited gift of eloquence—his one pre-eminently shining talent, and the chiefest cause of his brilliant success. Happy college associations and a good Oxford degree, an early marriage of exceptional affection, and a charming living in the Isle of Wight made life all sunshine, and preferment to a canonry and the archdeaconry

of Winchester were universally regarded as but steps to higher promotion, when the dark shadow fell which secretly clouded all his after-life in the death of the young wife, whom he passionately loved. The deep pathos of the book lies in the glimpses given us of the undying strength of this attachment and of the bishop's affectionate and sympathetic nature. The interest of his episcopacy, which revolutionized the then recognized conception of the office, lies in the technical and professional duties, which the general preface abjures, in descriptions of the bishop's method of ordination and confirmation, in his organization of his diocese and his work for the Church beyond it. Mr. Wilberforce rightly emphasizes his father's intense attachment to the discipline and doctrine of the Church of England. It was his absolute ideal, and implicit loyalty to it his supreme rule. We could have spared some of the social details here given—what can it matter with whom a man dined or breakfasted half a century ago?—to make space for fuller understanding of, and deeper insight into, a loving and holy nature, which at times hardly did justice to itself in the eyes of the world.

Leaders of the Church. 1800-1900. Edited by GEORGE W. E. RUSSELL. *Dean Church.* By D. C. LATHBURY. *Canon Liddon.* By G. W. E. RUSSELL. *Bishop Westcott.* By JOSEPH CLAYTON. (London: Mowbray. 1905-1906.) Price 3s. 6d. each.

In addition to the charming portrait of a delightful personality, the volume on Dean Church contains valuable examples of his views upon matters which are still of the utmost importance. The Dean's attitude towards the 'Ritualists' of the seventies, with his own personal non-use of vestments—in 1874 he says that the only vestment he had ever seen was the cope of the Bishop of London, worn at the Trinity Ordination (p. 104)—shewed clearly that the position of the Ritualists was not based upon matters of man-millinery but of Church principles. The position taken by the Dean with regard to the Public Worship Regulation Act called attention to the true relation of the Church to the State, and the Dean's writings upon that subject will form an important part of the Church's case, if ever she decides to break off that union with the State which hampers her so much to-day. The fact that a man of Dean Church's standing, and with his calm and judicial mind, should

once or twice have seriously considered whether he ought not to resign his Deanery as a protest against encroachments by the State into the domain of the Church, will always be a strength to the Church's position.

The Dean's view of *Lux Mundi* is in striking contrast to that taken by Canon Liddon. Dean Church considered that the excitement caused by that book was 'due to the omission of Churchmen to prepare to meet these anxious and disturbing questions,' and that 'it pointed to the need of some constructive handling of the questions "What the Bible really is," and "How it came to be"' (p. 162). Liddon, on the other hand, could never see that even earnest Christians in days of inquiry and criticism need some guidance in such matters, and that they are bound to feel the incidence of such questions and perplexities.

It is news to us to learn that in the sixties a beard was looked upon as a ritualistic badge (p. 104).

The editor has taken Canon Liddon's life as his own contribution to the series, and he has given us a powerful, interesting, and clear picture of the personality and life of the great preacher, who has impressed thousands of his countrymen by his eloquence and piety. The book is of the greatest interest and will be read by many a man who is repelled by the ordinary biography.

There are one or two points which perhaps display the lay mind of the author, but which we think that his hero would have greatly regretted to see printed in a biography of his. The slighting way in which the Anglican Bishops are referred to would hardly be in keeping with the real teaching of Canon Liddon. If we grant that they have displayed a miserable lack of leadership during the past fifty or sixty years, and have disappointed the hopes which their friends entertained for them when they were first elevated to the episcopate, still we do not think that Canon Liddon would have wished his strictures upon his Fathers in God, expressed in private to personal friends, to go forth in a book, at a time when most of the Bishops of whom he had complained had passed to their rest, and in a book especially intended for the use of laymen.

The clerical mind wonders if the somewhat contemptuous references to the Bishops really represent the present-day lay mind towards the leaders of our Church. But it is not only Bishops in general who fall under Mr. Russell's lash, there are allusions to particular bishops, who are still living, which must cause considerable pain to them and to their friends. Men

revered and respected like the Bishop of Oxford and the Bishop of Birmingham deserve to be treated with greater consideration than they receive here at Mr. Russell's hands. Hero-worship can fail in its object, and we feel that Mr. Russell's attempt to prove that "in the life and character of Henry Parry Liddon the modern Church saw reproduced the attributes which marked the Saints of Apostolic and sub-Apostolic times" (p. 195) will fail, by its suggestion of exaggeration, to convince the English public of the real worth of Canon Liddon's life and work. No man is perfect or wholly wise, and we venture to suggest that Canon Liddon's attitude towards *Lux Mundi* was not altogether so entirely the only view that he could have taken of that book as Mr. Russell seems to think.

Dr. Westcott was not so much a figure in current controversies as Dean Church or Dr. Liddon. The greater part of his life was passed in more or less seclusion, and until he became Bishop of Durham, he had not come much before the notice of the public. But those last ten years of his life were sufficient to shew how fully a great mind and a trained theologian can, by his grasp of first principles and simple Christian piety, not only influence the rough and unlearned for good, but also make a real impression upon the whole land even in matters so uneclesiastical as Trades Unions and business concerns.

At the time of his death, we may suppose that the Bishop of Durham was the most influential of the English bishops, and his published works have a very large circulation. This volume is a quiet and simple review of a saintly and devoted life, and calls for but little in the way of criticism. The social teaching of Bishop Westcott is of the greatest importance in these days when Labour is realizing its power, and Mr. Clayton has summarized very clearly what the teaching of the Bishop on these matters is.

To Modern Maidens. By 'A Modern Matron.' (Edinburgh : Morton. 1905.) Price 3s. 6d.

THIS book teems with admirable advice and cannot fail to be read with interest and amusement. But the writer has a serious aim, and from this point of view much that is good in it appears to us to be unfortunately neutralized by the wholesale condemnation it pronounces on present-day conditions. Girls have a keen sense of justice ; will they accept this judgement as fair or true ?

It is not an altogether winning appeal which is addressed to them on page 13 : ' Your grandmothers were carefully taught their duty to God and to their neighbours ; but you scorn duty as an old-world fetish.' As the modern maiden has probably inherited not only her features and traits but also her sense of responsibility or of self-indulgence from a conscientious or a frivolous grandmother, and as our modern circumstances were forged and framed by our ancestors, and we have hardly yet had time to hear the blows on Time's anvil hammered by the generation of yesterday or to-day, it is surely unfair to lay the blame for present day failings entirely on present day people. Yet the writer's precious balms break impartially the heads of modern maidens, modern servants, modern poor, modern educators, modern wives, mothers, and housemistresses. She laments that ' religion has no longer any hold upon the working classes ' ; that ' modern sentimentality shudders at such vulgar directness of education [as Mr. Squeers] and prefers to see the country elegantly snuffed out with theories ' ; that ' the Higher Education has been, so far as the home is concerned, a kind of minotaur ' ; and that ' with the stamping out of the middle classes by modern legislation the concurrent passing of the home and general deterioration of the national character ' are to be noted.

Now, sweeping assertions are generally untrustworthy ; and although legislation must plead guilty to having ' stamped out ' the highwaymen, bad roads, and other hindrances to travelling, which largely contributed to make our forefathers a home-abiding race in hall or cottage, it cannot be accused of having crushed the middle classes completely out of existence ; every home has not yet vanished ; our churches still gather worshippers from poor and rich alike ; and our schools still produce scholars who love and revere their homes and their country, and who serve them faithfully in life and in death. ' Frivolity, vice, and ineptitude are all that the nation can offer for the management of a great empire,' says the Modern Matron. Does she realize the meaning of this portentous accusation ?

Whilst we recognize the supreme duty of pointing out life's danger signals to the inexperienced, we regret in this book the ' winston-churchillisms ' , which can neither edify nor hearten those who have started on their pilgrimage in ' quest of truth.'

In conclusion, we will add, in correction of a misstatement on page 199, that it was Lord Grey, not Sir Edward Grey, who formed the Public House Trusts.

Il Santo : Romanzo. By ANTONIO FOGAZZARO. (Milano : Baldini. 1905.) Price 5 lire. *The Saint : English Translation.* (London : Hodder and Stoughton. 1906.) Price 6s.

At the house of a learned and devout layman, a leader of the progressive Catholics, Giovanni Selva, a party of friends are met to discuss the formation of a society for the catholic reform of the Roman Church. A French Abbé, whose sardonic wit and selfish caution suggest the portrait of a well-known person, discourages the scheme, remarking that the first requisite is a saint. Where is the saint to be found ?

Piero Maironi, a gentleman of Brescia, has turned from a sinful intrigue to a life of deep and generous penitence, and has been instructed by a vision that he is destined to a special apostolate. To perfect his repentance and to prepare for his vocation he has hidden himself at the Convent of St. Scholastica at Subiaco, not indeed purposing to become a monk, but serving, under the name of Benedetto, as a gardener. There he has found a wise guide in Don Clemente, himself a disciple of Selva. Bidden to leave the monastery by the new abbot, who is equally afraid of heterodoxy and of intrigue, Maironi finds a resting-place in the miserable village of Jenne, where his ascetic life and his simple teaching of Christian goodness win for him from the country-folk the reputation of a wonder-worker and the title of *Il Santo*, which he deprecates. The description of his life at Jenne, amid a crowd of pilgrims, some devout, some superstitious, and some captious, reads like a chapter from the *Fioretti*.

Driven hence by the malice of those who hate to be reformed, Maironi goes to Rome, where, maintaining himself by labour as a gardener, he teaches the common people, who hear him gladly, and also those who long for the reformation of the Church. The Pope—a true *Papa angelico*—gives him a private interview, and encourages him to point out four great maladies of the Church—falsehood, priestly domination, avarice, and immobility, which will take no heed of the needs and the progress of the times. The Pope assents ; but what can he do, an old man, and charged with the welfare not only of the few who desire reform but of the many to whom reform is terrible ? Jealous of the Pope's favour, Maironi's enemies hand him over by a paltry bargain to the unbelieving authorities of the State, who press him to leave Rome ; but he is stricken with fever and dies, urging his disciples to carry on his work of teaching Christian holiness.

We will not attempt a detailed review of the romance as a work of art. There is much in it of Italian grace and fragrance : something also which is unrestrained and sentimental. The dialogue is inferior to the descriptions, and the interest culminates in four scenes—the meeting in Selva's house, the day at Jenne, the interview with the Pope, and the saint's death-bed. Our chief concern is with the question, How far does the saint contribute to the reformation of the Church ? It may be felt that more trenchant remedies are needed to combat the superstitious devotions, the formality, the lax morality, the tyranny of authority which discountenances individual thought and drives thinkers into reluctant unbelief ; and we cannot be surprised that some Italians regard the conclusions of the book as futile. But Maironi is put before us, not as a theologian or a philosopher, but as a saint. Selva and Don Clemente survive to contribute their part to the work of emancipation. Those who watch with sympathy, yet not without anxiety, the progressive movement in the Roman Church will be glad that the leaders of it are reminded that, as the first teachers of the Church were men who had become saints by close communion with Christ, so her reformation must spring from men of the like temper. Criticism is necessary, but it will be destructive and dangerous unless it is guided by holiness and devotion. ' Sono gl' individui, i Messia, che fanno progredire le scienze e la religione. Vi è un Santo fra voi ? Prendetelo e mandatelo avanti.'

Since this review was written the book has been both placed upon the Index and translated into several European languages. In its attractive English form it will probably find many readers who will, we think, wonder somewhat at the extreme violence with which it has been attacked abroad.

Burford Papers. Being Letters of Samuel Crisp to his Sister at Burford, and other Studies of a Century (1745-1845). By WILLIAM HOLDEN HUTTON, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of St. John Baptist College, Oxford. (London : Constable & Co. 1905.) Price 7s. 6d. net.

THIS volume contains a collection of miscellaneous articles chiefly written in or concerning the 'Great House' at Burford which is the author's home. They cast light upon the literary circle of Fanny Burney at the time of her first success as a novelist, and on daily country life in Warwickshire, a century and a half ago, among people to-day of somewhat faded interest and im-

portance. Glimpses of Bath at the height of its renown and of Oxford dons for three generations ; snapshots of Wellington and Walter Scott behind the scenes ; silhouettes of Dr. Johnson and John Wesley, of Crabbe and Shenstone, of Graves and Stern ; recollections of Oxford Jacobites and exiled Stewarts, mingle with worldly prelates and easy-going parsons, in these fugitive essays written with all the dexterity of an accomplished *littérateur*. The charm of the volume lies in the complete harmony between the spirit of the writer and the subjects of his pen ; in his unaffected admiration for the sweet peaceful stretches of Warwickshire and the Cotswolds, and for the finished beauty of the famous Somersetshire watering-place ; in his sympathy with all that is best and truest in the eighteenth-century type, so apprehensive of enthusiasm, so placid and complacent, as well as, in most of Mr. Hutton's examples, so devout and kindly ; and in his power to bring out the best in lives which contrast so strongly with our own. For the most part the persons grouped together here did good in their generation, and they brightened country life for one particular district with unaffected love of literature and the arts. The *Burford Papers* present us with the landscape and soft melting tones of Sleepy Hollow, and as we close it the line recurs to us involuntarily :

‘ And birds of calm sat brooding o’er the charmèd wave.’

Lectures and Essays. By ALFRED AINGER. 2 vols. (London : Macmillan and Co. 1905.) Price 15s. net.

Dulcia sunt. Though intended for application to higher things, the Horatian maxim, which the present President of Magdalen, himself a writer of great tact and sensibility, translated for Tennyson's benefit into the simple words ‘ they must have charm ’ suggests a fair test for more common uses. Thus it may be invoked when the expediency of republishing popular ‘ lectures and essays ’ such as those contained in the volume before us is under consideration ; and if an appeal were made to it in the present instance, there could be no doubt as to the result. We make no apology for describing these papers as ‘ popular.’ Ainger, who hated all affectation in others, and for a man of letters was singularly free from it himself, never posed as a specialist ; and it was consequently pure joy to him, when, as in the admirable little bit of conjectural criticism on *Cole-ridge's Ode to Wordsworth*, he made a successful expedition

into the arctic regions of textual commentary. He was not in the habit of confronting perplexities; it is suggestive that in the luminous but not particularly profound lectures on *The Three Stages of Shakespeare's Art* he sails by the rock of *Henry VI.*; and perhaps neither the lectures on Chaucer nor that on Scott called for inclusion in the present collection. In a general way, Ainger, with a self-knowledge that is true wisdom and which in his case added to the influence exercised by him on his audience or his readers, contented himself with the exposition and illustration of canons of criticism in his judgement worth upholding, and worth presenting afresh to a generation misled, as all generations are, by the worship of a multitude of new idols. But this task could not be effectually accomplished without that quality of charm which hearers of his spoken addresses might well be excused for supposing to be inseparable from his personality. The editor of Ainger's literary remains has judged rightly in challenging the correctness of such a supposition. The charm attaching to some of these lectures and essays is an intrinsic and a permanent charm; and in certain instances, such as the fine essay on *The Ethical Element in Shakespeare*, or the discussion of the religious opinions of Swift, though the same delicacy of touch is preserved, the very root of the matter is reached.

Whether as a writer or in familiar intercourse, Ainger was always welcome and enjoyable because together with the quality of 'charm' he possessed another for which we have no precise English word. For our 'common sense' is something different from *le bon sens* of our neighbours, which implies the *consensus* of the 'right sort' of men and critics—a sense which, thanks to what breeding and education have done towards its collective formation, can never go wrong. The word 'sanity,' as applied by Ainger to Shakespeare—'his perception from the beginning of what was real and genuine in art as well as in human life,' comes near to the meaning of the French term, but fails quite to cover it. Ainger, by an exquisitely fine perception, by an incomparably quick wit, and by an extraordinary power of self-restraint rooted in religious depths in his nature, which this is not the occasion for seeking to sound, compassed the possession of the sixth sense in question. It saved him from blunders in which many men more learned than himself have taken pride; it preserved in him sympathies which, to catch the passing breeze, critics are prepared to sacrifice without a pang; it prevented him from ever sacrificing matter to what

is called style, or truth to effect ; and it made him an absolutely trustworthy guide to much that is best and imperishable in the literature which he loved with his whole heart.

Religion and Health : their Mutual Relationship and Influence.

By NORMAN PORRITT, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., F.N.S.A., Consulting Surgeon, Huddersfield Infirmary. (London : Skeffington and Son. 1905.) Price 3s. 6d.

BELIEVING in the wholeness of human nature, in the close interdependence of religion, morality, and physical wellbeing, the writer has given us, in ten chapters, none of which is dull or uninteresting, a strong plea for the exertion of the Church's influence in all matters that relate to national health. Great stress is laid upon the remarkable statistics among the families of our Hebrew population as compared with Gentiles of the same class and environment. Chapter VII is devoted to the red-herring of Christian Science. The whole book may be read with profit by all who are called to face the problems of city life.

PERIODICALS.

The Journal of Theological Studies (Vol. VII. No. 27. April 1906. Frowde). R. H. Kennett : 'The Prophecy in Isaiah ix. 1-7 (Heb. viii. 23-ix. 6).' Sir H. H. Howorth : 'The Modern Roman Canon and the Book of Esdras A.' C. H. Turner : 'Niceta and Ambrosiaster, II.' W. O. E. Oesterley : 'Codex Taurinensis (Y),' IV. Amos (Greek text). F. C. Conybeare : 'The Codex of the *Paschal Chronicle* used by Holstein.' Mgr. G. Mercati : 'A Study of the *Paschal Chronicle*.' Dom J. Chapman : 'The Brethren of the Lord.' J. H. Srawley : 'St. Gregory of Nyssa on the Sinlessness of Christ.' W. E. Barnes : 'The "Nicene" Creed in the Syriac Psalter.' T. Barns : 'The *Magnificat* in Niceta of Remesiana and Cyril of Jerusalem.' E. S. Buchanan : 'Two Pages from the Fleury Palimpsest.' Dom G. Morin : 'Victorinus of Pettau.' Reviews. W. H. Hutton : 'Dudden, *Gregory the Great*.' W. E. Barnes : 'Old Testament Chronicle.' F. R. Tennant and C. C. J. Webb : 'Philosophy of Religion.'

The Expositor (Series VII. Nos. 4-6. April-June 1906. Hodder and Stoughton). T. K. Cheyne : 'The Archangel Michael in the Light of Criticism.' University Sermon. A. E. Garvie : 'Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus : XIV. The Perfection of Character' (*continued* June. XV. 'The Consciousness of the Son'). G. A. Smith : 'The Desolate City.' (May : 'The Ideal City and the Real.' June.—'The Second Temple, from Zechariah to Ezra.') C. H. W. Johns : 'The Amorite Calendar.' W. H. Bennett : 'The Life of Christ according to St. Mark' (*continued*). W. M. Ramsay : 'Tarsus, the River and the Sea' (*continued* May). W. J. Moulton : 'The New Covenant in Jeremiah.' E. Nestle : 'From the Tree.' Criticizes Mr. J. H. A. Hart (*Expositor*, November 1905). May.—W. Sanday : 'The Spiritual Meaning of the Life of Christ.' Very favourable review

of 'W. P. du Bose, *The Gospel in the Gospels*.' H. R. Mackintosh: 'The Theology of Ritschl.' C. Lattey, S.J.: 'The Structure of the Fourth Gospel.' J. Moffatt: 'Notes on Recent N.T. Study' (*continued* June). S. A. Cook: 'Old Testament Notes.' June. T. H. Robinson: 'The Authorship of the Muratorian Canon.' S. A. Cook: 'The Criticism of the Old Testament.' W. M. Ramsay: 'Derbe.'

The Hibbert Journal (Vol. IV. No. 3. April 1906. Williams and Norgate). Dom E. C. Butler: 'Is the Religion of the Spirit a Working Religion for Mankind? A Catholic's Reflections on Auguste Sabatier's *Religions of Authority*.' J. E. Carpenter: 'How Japanese Buddhism appeals to a Christian Theist.' E. S. Drown: 'Does Christian Belief require Metaphysics?' Bishop of Carlisle: 'Mr. Birrell's Choice.' H. Jones: 'The Working Faith of the Social Reformer, III. The Metaphysical Basis—Mine and Thine.' E. G. Gardner: 'St. Catherine of Siena.' W. Jones-Davies: 'The Laws and Limits of Development in Christian Doctrine.' The Author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*: 'The Salvation of the Body by Faith.' T. W. Rolleston: 'The Resurrection and A Laymen's Dialogue.' Sir O. Lodge: 'Christianity and Science, II. The Divine Element in Christianity.' Discussions. Reviews. Bishop of Southwark: 'W. N. Clarke, *Outline of Christian Theology*.' C. J. Keyser: 'Mallock, *The Reconstruction of Belief*.' G. E. Moore: 'Sidgwick, *Lectures on the Philosophy of Kant*.' W. Harris: 'Cambridge Theological Essays.' Bishop of Clogher: 'Lodge, *Life and Matter*.' R. R. Rusk: 'Kappa, *Let Youth but Know*.'

The American Journal of Theology (Vol. X. No. 2. April 1906. University of Chicago Press). W. R. Harper—'In Memoriam.' W. W. Walker: 'Changes in Theology among American Congregationalists.' E. S. Ames: 'Theology from the Standpoint of Functional Psychology.' M. S. Terry: 'The Old Testament and the Christ.' J. M. P. Smith: 'The Rise of Individualism among the Hebrews.' L. Arpee: 'Armenian Paulicianism and the Key of Truth.' H. Preble and S. M. Jackson: 'Bernard the Monk, *The Scorn of the World*' (*continued*). Reviews:—C. C. Torrey: 'Harper, *Amos and Hosea*.' J. E. McFadyen: 'Batten, *The Hebrew Prophet*' and 'Harper, *The Prophetic Element in the Old Testament*.' 'Recent Literature on the Old Testament.' W. J. Moulton: 'Bugge, *Die Haupt-Parabeln Jesu*.' A. C. Zenos: 'Harnack: *Expansion of Christianity*' and 'Knopf, *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*.' W. Rauschenbusch: 'Bigg, *The Church's Task under the Roman Empire*' and 'Bittlinger, *Die Materialisierung religiöser Vorstellungen*' (important). E. B. Hulbert: 'A. Plummer, *English Church History (Henry VII.—Archbishop Parker)*' [unfavourable]; 'Donaldson, *Westminster Confession of Faith and the XXXIX Articles*.' F. Johnson: 'Conybeare-Maclean, *Rituale Armenorum*.' H. A. Youtz: 'G. T. Ladd, *The Philosophy of Religion*.' G. B. Foster: 'Höfding, *Problems of Philosophy*.'

The Princeton Theological Review (Vol. IV. No. 2. April 1906. Philadelphia: MacCalla and Co.). B. B. Warfield: 'Tertullian and the Beginnings of the Doctrine of the Trinity, III.' J. de Witt: 'The Intellectual life of Samuel Miller.' M. C. Williams: 'Preaching Christ.' D. S. Schaff: 'The Sacramental Theory of the Mediaeval Church.' S. T. Lowrie: 'Exegetical Note on 2 Cor. v. 16-17.' Reviews:—H. C. Minton:

'J. M. Sterrett, *Freedom of Authority*' and 'Bishop Moule and others, *Words of Help on Belief and Conduct*' [favourable]. W. B. Greene, jun.: 'Edmunds-Anesaki, *Buddhist and Christian Gospels*'; 'G. Steindorff, *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians*.' W. D. Kerswill: 'A. S. Peake, *Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament*.' G. Vos: 'S. Mathews: *Messianic Hope in New Testament*.' L. W. Loetscher: 'A. F. Pollard, *Thomas Cranmer*.'

The Dublin Review (Vol. CXXXVIII. No. 277. April 1906. Burnas and Oates). 'Cardinal Newman and Creative Theology.' R. H. Benson: 'An Historical Meditation.' W. Barry: 'The Holy Latin Tongue.' M. Jaurès and M. Clémenceau (*sic*): 'A Contrast of Temperaments.' B. C. A. Windle: 'Weismann and the Germ-Plasm Theory.' Bishop of Limerick: 'Irish University Education.' Baron Fr. von Hügel: 'Experience and Transcendence.' 'Christian Doctrine in an Early Eastern Church.' Teaching of Aphraates. Reviews: 'W. Barry, *Tradition of Scripture*.' 'F. H. Dudden, *Gregory the Great*.' ['More accurately entitled, "Digressions from the Life of Gregory the Great."'] 'P. N. Waggett, *The Scientific Temper in Religion*.' Very favourable. 'Picard, *La Transcendance de Jésus-Christ*. Very favourable.

The Interpreter (Vol. II. No. 3. April 1906. Simpkin, Marshall & Co.). 'Editorial Notes.' Notices works by Drs. Sanday, Knowling, Büchler, King, and Fr. Waggett. A. Wright: 'Introduction to the Gospel according to St. Matthew.' C. F. Burney: 'The Christian Interpretation of Messianic Prophecy.' A. M. Fairbairn: 'The Love of Jesus, Personal, Discriminative, and Formative.' F. J. Foakes-Jackson: 'Some Practical Lessons of Early Church History.' C. H. W. Johns: 'The Prophets in Babylonia.' C. F. Rogers: 'A Plea for the Scientific Study of Pastoral Theology.' P. J. Boyer: 'Assyria and Israel, II.' Reviews: 'E. A. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*.' 'Harnack, *Militia Christi*.' 'Bishop of Stepney, *The Opportunity of the Church of England*.' 'C. F. Rogers, *Principles of Parish Work*.' 'V. S. S. Coles, *Pastoral Work in Country Districts*.' 'W. H. Frere, *Principles of Religious Ceremonial*.' 'I. Gregory Smith, *What is Truth?*'

The Jewish Quarterly Review (Vol. XVIII. No. 71. April 1906. Macmillan). A. Cowley: 'Bodleian Geniza Fragments [MS. Hebr. F. 34]. With a beautiful facsimile. L. Simon: 'Abraham Mapu.' L. Ginzberg: 'Geonic Responsa, VII.' Hebrew Texts. A. B. Rhine: 'Leon Gordon as a Poet.' G. Margoliouth: 'Introduction to the Liturgy of the Damascene Karaites.' MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 2531. Hebrew Text and Translation. S. A. Cook: 'Notes on Old Testament History; IV. Saul and Benjamin.' N. Porges: 'Bacher, *Die Bibel- u. Traditionsexegetische Terminologie der Amoräer*.' I. Elbogen: 'Hoffmann, *Mechilta de-Rabbi Simon b. Jochai*.' H. S. Lewis: 'A. Schwarz, *Der Mischneh-Thorah*.' S. Poznański: 'S. Gitelsohn, *Die Civil-Gesetze der Karäer von Samuel al-Magrebi*.' W. Bacher, R. Gottheil, H. A. Wiener and A. Marx: 'Schäm als Name Palästina's.' I. A[brahams]: 'Bibliography of Hebraica and Judaica' (January-March 1906).

The Expository Times (Vol. XVII. Nos. 7-9. April-June 1906. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark). I. M. Price: 'W. R. Harper.' A. E. Burn: 'The Treasure Committed to your Charge.' Ordination Sermon.

'The Reading of Scripture in Public Worship.' G. G. Cameron: 'The Masai and their Primitive Traditions.' Gwatkin: *The Eye for Spiritual Things*; 'On The Problem of the Old Testament.' Critical. 'Dom Edmonds, *The Early Scottish Church*.' Patrick, James, *the Lord's Brother*.' 'K. L. Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe: a Study of Aboriginal Life in Australia*.' 'Crawley, *The Tree of Life*.' E. König: 'Has the name "Jahweh" been found among the Canaanites?' A. Condamin, S. J.: 'Double for all her sins.' May.—A. E. Garvie: 'The New Method of Studying the Bible' (continued June). P. Dearmer: 'Gifts of Healing' (continued June). W. O. E. Oesterley: 'A Lost Uncial Codex of the Psalms.' The burnt Turin Psalter B. vii. 30. W. C. Braithwaite: 'The Teaching of the Transfiguration.' J. Iverach: 'E. G. Haldane, *Descartes*.' 'Westermarck, *Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*.' S. Lewis: 'The Evangelion da-Mepharreshe.' June.—A. S. Lewis: 'Our Sixth Visit to Mt. Sinai.' A. H. McNeile: 'The Spiritual Value of Genesis iii.' A. M. Hyamson: 'Anglo-Jewish Literature in 5665.' A. H. Sayce: 'The Study of Sumerian.' W. R. Morfill: 'K. K. Gross, *Die Russischen Sekten*.' 'T. M. Lindsay, *History of the Reformation*, I.' 'Marshall, *Aristotle's Theory of Conduct*.'

The Baptist Review and Expositor (Vol. III. No. 2. April 1906. Louisville, Ky.). H. C. Vedder: 'A Study of the Fourth Gospel.' Expository. W. W. Everts: 'Aristotle's Theology.' W. T. Whitley: 'The Epistle to the Hebrews.' A. T. Robertson: 'Is Matt. xvi. 18 an anachronism?' R. W. Weaver: 'The Essence of Christianity.' I. M. Price: 'Some Phases of the Literature of the Old Testament and the Literature of the Ancient Orient.' W. J. McGlothlin: 'Vedder, *Balthasar Hübmayer*,' and 'H. Barge, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt*.' E. Y. Mullins: 'Mallock, *Reconstruction of Religious Belief*.' W. O. Carver: 'S. Mathews, *The Messianic Hope in the New Testament*.' E. C. Dargan: 'A. W. Small, *General Sociology from Spencer to Ratzenhofer*.' Important. J. P. Greene: 'R. J. Campbell, *The Song of Ages*.' J. R. Sampey: 'W. R. Harper, *The Priestly Element in the Old Testament*,' and 'Constructive Studies in the Prophetic Element in the Old Testament.'

The Irish Theological Quarterly (Vol. I. No. 2. April 1906. Dublin: Gill and Son). V. Ermoni: 'A. Sabatier's Religious System.' J. MacCaffrey: 'The Vatican and France.' J. MacRory: 'Fr. Pesch on Inspiration.' J. M. Harty: 'The Church and the Unborn Child, II.' P. J. Toner: 'The Modern Kenotic Theory, II.' W. McDonald: 'The Revival of Mysticism.' M. O'Riordan: 'Gaudé, *Theologia Moralis S. Alphonsi*.' J. MacRory: 'Barry, *The Tradition of Scripture*,' and 'Schäfer, *Die Parabeln des Herrn in Homilien*.' Very favourable. J. MacCaffrey: 'K. Kunste, *Antipriscilliana*,' 'Dudden, *Gregory the Great*,' and 'Delehaye, *Les Légendes hagiographiques*.' Good reviews. W. McDonald: 'Cambridge Theological Essays.'

The Independent Review (Vol. IX. Nos. 31-33. April-June 1906. Unwin). J. A. Hobson: 'The Taxation of Monopolies.' C. Jackson: 'Flaws in Elementary Education.' G. J. Holyoake: 'Woman Suffrage: a Suggestion.' A. C. W. Tillyard: 'The Florentine Movement.' B. Russell: 'McTaggart, *Some Dogmas of Religion*.' May. J. M. Robertson: 'The Secular Solution.' A. H. Byles: 'The Elberfeld System in

England.' The 'Pauper' question. L. Doncaster : 'Darwin and Mendel.' H. Rashdall : '*Memoirs of Archbishop Temple*.' G. L. Strachey : 'The Poetry of Blake.' G. M. Trevelyan : 'O. Browning, *Boyhood and Youth of Napoleon*.' June. M. Sadler : 'The Future of Denominational Schools.' U. Gohier : 'Anti-Militarism in France.' J. W. Gulland : 'Scotland's Political Aspirations.' Interesting. A. Eiloart : 'A West Indian Ireland [Barbados].' I. H. Mitchell : 'Conciliation and Arbitration in Trade Disputes.' F. W. Maitland : 'Henry Sidgwick.' J. A. Hobson : 'Rowntree and Sherwell, *Taxation of the Liquor Trade*.' B. Russell : 'H. H. Joachim, *The Nature of Truth*.' J. N. Figgis : 'Mackinnon, *History of Modern Liberty*.'

The Edinburgh Review (No. 416. April 1906. Longmans). '*In Memoriam after Fifty Years*.' 'The Jardin des Plantes before and during the Revolution.' 'Criticisms of Life in Ireland.' Novels by G. A. Birmingham and G. Moore. 'Venetian Diplomacy at the Sublime Porte during the Sixteenth Century.' 'History in Furniture.' 'Archbishop Temple.' 'Pre-Raphaelitism.' 'Some Aspects of International Law.' 'The Royal Poor Law Commission, 1905, and the Condition of the Poor.'

The Quarterly Review (No. 407. April 1906. John Murray). A. C. Bradley : 'Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*.' 'The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood.' 'Some Letter-writers, Ancient and Modern.' P. F. Willert : 'The Literature of the French Renaissance.' 'The Art of Gambling.' 'Trade Unions and the Law.' 'A Plea for Cambridge.' M. Kaufmann : 'Pascal's Apologia.' T. Morison : 'An Indian Renaissance.' 'The Education Bill.'

The Classical Review (Vol. XX. Nos. 2-5. March-June 1906. D. Nutt). A. Gudeman : 'Burger, *Minucius Felix und Seneca*.' T. Nicklin : 'E. de W. Burton, *Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem*.' T. Ashby, jun. : 'Recent Excavations in Rome.' April.—'The Restored Pronunciation of Latin.' Gives the new scheme. T. Nicklin : 'E. A. Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary*.' An interesting review. (See also May.) J. P. Postgate : 'Olcott, *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Epigraphicae*, I.' Valuable. May. A. C. Clark : 'Sabbadini, *Le Scoperte dei codici Latini et Greci ne' secoli xiv. et xv.*' Interesting. June.—L. M. Bagge : 'The Early Numerals.' J. E. Harrison : 'Farnell, *Evolution of Religion*.'

The Contemporary Review (Nos. 483-6. March-June 1906. Horace Marshall). T. C. Horsfall : 'Health and Education.' W. F. Alexander : 'Revivalism and Mysticism.' S. C. de Soissons : 'The German Drama of To-day.' T. J. Macnamara : 'The Amendment of the Education Acts.' G. P. Gooch : 'The Unemployed.' April.—'Testis' : 'Religious Events in France.' W. H. Bennett : 'Archaeology and Criticism.' G. G. Coulton : 'The Truth about the Monasteries' [Reply by Fr. R. H. Benson, June]. A. E. Keeton : 'N. A. Rimski-Körsakov.' J. H. Rose : 'The Limitations of Napoleon's Genius.' P. T. Forsyth : 'The Catholic Threat of Passive Resistance.' P. Littell : 'Dramatic Form and Substance.' 'A Reader' : 'G. Lowes Dickinson, *A Modern Symposium*' and 'Marion Crawford, *Gleanings from Venetian History*.' May.—Lord Stanley of Alderley : 'The New Education Bill.' L. Jerrold : 'In the Courrières Country.' L. A. Atherley Jones : 'Trade Disputes.' T. Richard : 'China and the West.' W. D. Mackenzie : 'The Moral Consciousness of Jesus.'

H. Ellis: 'In the Footsteps of Ramon Lull.' Mr. Justice S. Nair: 'A Native Council for India.' L. March-Phillipps: 'Pre-Raphaelitism and the Present.' D. C. Pedder: 'The Parson and his Flock.' 'A Reader': 'Henry Sidgwick,' *Archbishop Temple*. June.—T. B. Burke: 'Herbert Spencer and the Master Key.' D. C. Pedder: 'Schoolmasters and their Masters.' H. W. V. Temperley: 'The Imperial Control of Native Races.' A. E. Garvie: 'Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide.' M. Higgs: 'Mankind in the Making.' E. S. Grossmann: 'The Decadence of Tragedy.' E. Vine Hall: 'The Clergy and the Church.' E. R. Pearse: 'The Extravagance of the Poor Law.' Important. 'A Reader': 'Hodgkin, *History of England to the Norman Conquest*.'

The Catholic World (Vol. LXXXIII. Nos. 493-5. April-June 1906. New York). E. A. Pace: 'Catholic Teachers and the History of Education.' W. J. Kerby: 'Life and Money' (continued May). G. Tyrrell: 'The Prayer of Christ' (continued). G. M. Searle: 'The Margin of Faith.' J. J. Fox: 'The Church and her Saints, III.' Deals with 'Delehaye, *Les Légendes hagiographiques*.' T. E. Shields: 'Catholic Teachers and Educational Progress.' 'The Political History of England, II., III., X.' (See also June). May.—W. Barry: 'Dante and the Spirit of Poetry.' M. D. Petre: 'Studies on Nietzsche' (continued, also June). F. A. Gasquet: 'Some Letters of Fr. Hecker' (continued June). 'L. Chaine, *Les Catholiques français et leurs Difficultés actuelles*.' W. Barry, *The Tradition of Scripture*; 'M. Prince, *The Dissociation of a Personality*.' A remarkable study of abnormal psychology. June.—This 'Franciscan' number contains a series of articles on St. Francis of Assisi in anticipation of the 700th anniversary of his conversion. J. J. Fox: 'Mrs. Wilfrid Ward's New Novel.' 'Sir O. Lodge, *Life and Matter*.' 'H. Lucas, S.J., *Fra Girolamo Savonarola*, second edition.' 'J. de Narfou, *Vers l'Église libre*.'

The Monthly Review (Nos. 67-9. April-June 1906. John Murray). F. Carrel: 'The Moral Crisis.' C. W. Saleeby: 'The Essential Factor of Progress.' A. Symons: 'Coventry Patmore—Supplementary Notes, with some unpublished Letters.' P. Uhlenhuth: 'The Blood-relationship of Man and Apes.' F. A. Steel: 'Marriage in the East and in the West.' M. Yates: 'Do our Girls take an Interest in Literature: The other side of the Question.' S. L. Bastin: 'Plant Growing in Artificial Light.' 'Archbishop Temple.' May.—M. E. Fraser: 'Japanese Statesmen.' R. A. Durand: 'Indentured Labour under British Rule.' I. C. Blackwood: 'Spiritualism.' F. Boyle: 'Accursed Races.' Cagots, Rodiyas, Do-bes, Soleibs. 'Lorimer, *The Author's Progress*.' 'Henry Sidgwick.' June.—W. Archer: 'Ibsen as I knew him.' A. Turnor: 'What English Landlords might do.' T. C. Tregarthen: 'The Survival of the Otter.'

The English Historical Review (Vol. XXI. No. 82. April 1906. Longmans). R. D. Shaw: 'The Fall of the Visigothic Power in Spain.' G. Edmundson, 'Early Relations of the Manos with the Dutch.' W. C. Abbott: 'The Long Parliament of Charles II., II.' F. M. Powicke: 'Roger of Wendover and the Coggeshall Chronicle.' G. J. Turner: 'The St. Albans Council of 1213.' P. S. Allen: 'Letters of Rudolph Agricola.' A. Lang: 'Cardinal Beaton and the Will of James V.' C. H. Firth: 'Secretary Thurloe on the Relations of England and Holland.' H. W. V. Temperley:

'Pitt's Retirement from Office, Oct. 5, 1761.' Reviews. E. R. Bevan : 'W. Otto, *Priester u. Tempel im hellenistischen Aegypten*.' A. H. J. Greenidge : 'Audolient, *Carthage Romaine*, 146 B.C.-698 A.D.' P. V. M. Benecke : 'Allard, *Dix Leçons sur le Martyre*.' J. E. Sandys : 'Roger, *l'Enseignement des Lettres Classiques d'Ausone à Alcuin*.' F. E. Warren : 'Bury, *Life of St. Patrick*.' Lengthy Review. E. W. Brooks : 'A. Gardner, *Theodore of Studium*.' P. Vinogradoff : 'Rhamm, *Die Grosshufen der Nordgermanen*.' A. Souter : 'Hellmann, *Sedulius Scottus*.' E. Barker, 'T. Frantz, *Der grosse Kampf zwischen Kaisertum und Papsttum zur Zeit des Hohenstaufen Friedrich II*.' J. Gairdner : 'A. D. Innes, *England under the Tudors*.' A. F. Pollard : 'Barge, *Andreas Bodenstein von Carlstadt*, I.' J. Gairdner : 'G. E. Phillips, *The Extinction of the Ancient Hierarchy*' [Elizabethan Persecution]. 'H. Paul, *Life of Froude*.' T. D. Atkinson : 'J. T. Evans, *Church Plate of Pembrokeshire*.'

The Economic Review (Vol. XVI. No. 2. April 1906. Rivingtons). J. M. Thompson : 'The Claim of Christian Socialism.' A. Hook : 'The Problem of the Unearned Increment.' H. W. Wolff : 'Neglected Opportunities of Co-operation.' Reviews. J. G. Leigh : 'A. Small, *General Sociology*.' J. R. Brooke : 'Chiozza Money, *Riches and Poverty*.' H. W. Wolff, *Les Lois d'Assurance Ouvrière à l'Étranger : III., Assurance contre l'Invalidité*. W. M. Geldart : 'Vinogradoff, *Growth of the Manor*.'

Revue Biblique Internationale (N.S. Vol. III. No. 2. April 1906. Paris: Lecoffre). 'Lettre Apostolique de S.S. Pape Pie X.' 'Lettre de S.S. Pie X. à Mgr. Le Camus.' Mgr. P. Batiffol : 'Le Judaïsme de la Dispersion tendait-il à devenir une Église?' H. Vincent : 'Les villes cananéennes d'après les fouilles récentes' (*suite*). Illustrated. A. Baumstark : 'Les Apocryphes coptes.' Lengthy and important. L. Féderlin : 'A propos d'Isaïe x. 29-31.' With map of the Assyrians' route (Gaba'a to Jerusalem). P. Dhorme : 'Deux Textes religieux assyro-babyloniens.' J. Germer-Durand : 'Découvertes archéologiques à Aboughoch.' H. Vincent : 'Les Fouilles de Ta'annak.' P. Batiffol : 'E. von der Goltz, *Tischgebete u. Abendmahlsgebete in der altchristl. u. in der griechisch. Kirche*' and 'De Virginitate, eine echte Schrift des Athanasius.' M. J. Lagrange : 'Card. Rampolla, *Santa Melania Giuniore*.' 'C. Pesch, S.J., *De Inspiratione Sacrae Scripturae*' (review 11½ pages). A. Lemonnyer : 'Le Camus, *L'Œuvre des Apôtres*.' H. Vincent : 'Peters-Thiersch, *Painted Tombs in the Necropolis of Marissa*.' 'Brünnow-Domaszewski, *Die Provincia Arabia*, II.'; 'Strzygowski, *Eine Alexandrinische Weltchronik*.' 'E. A. Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary*.'; 'E. Nagl, *Die nachdavidische Königsgeschichte Israels*.'; 'W. Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie des jüdischen Traktatensliteratur*.'; 'L. H. Jordan, *Comparative Religion*.'; 'Muss-Arnolt, *Assyrisch-Englisch-Deutschen Handwörterbuch*.'

Revue Bénédictine (Vol. XXIII. No. 1. April 1906. Abbaye de Maredsous). M. de Bruyne : 'Encore les *Tractatus Origenis*.' G. Morin : 'Studia Caesariana. Nouvelle série d'inédits tirée du MS. 3 d'Épinal.' A. Palmieri, 'Un document inédit sur la rebaptisation des Latins chez les Grecs.' MS. Bibl. Syll. Philol. Constantinopol. 14. P. de Meester : 'Études sur la théologie orthodoxe. II. La théologie proprement dite. Dieu, Un dans son Essence.' M. Festuquière : 'Quelle sera la Philosophie de l'Église?' H. Quentin : 'Elpidius, évêque de Huesca, et les souscrip-

tions du deuxième Concile de Tolède.' U. Berlière: 'Les Coutumiers monastiques (X^e-XI^e siècles).' T. Nève: 'Le Concile de Trente.' Reviews:— P. de Meester: 'Gassisi, *I manoscritti autografi di S. Nilo Iunioro, fondatore del monastero di S. M. di Grottaferrata*'; 'Bacher, *Un traité des œuvres arabes de Théodore Abou-Kurra, évêque de Haran*'; 'Decharme, *La critique des traditions religieuses chez les Grecs*.' D. de Bruyne: 'Engert, *Ehe- u. Familienrecht der Hebräer*'; 'Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*'; 'Klostermann, *Eusebius Werke*, IV.'; 'Kunstle, *Antipriscilliana*'; 'Harnack, *Mission u. Ausbreitung*.' U. Berlière: 'Meistermann, *La Ville de David*'; 'J. Martin, *Gustave Vasa et la réforme en Suède*'; 'Grupp, *Kultur auf den alten Kellen u. Germanen*'; T. Nève: 'Minocchi, *I Salmi*.' B. Lebbe: 'J. Rivière, *Le Dogme de la Rédemption*'; 'Allard, *Dix Leçons sur le Martyre*'; 'Leclercq, *Les Martyres*' et 'L'Espagne chrétienne.' R. Proost: 'A. de Lapparent, *Science et Apologétique*.' G. Morin: 'Cavellera, *Le schisme d'Antioche (IV^e-V^e siècles)*.' P. Bastien: 'Lesne, *La hiérarchie épiscopale en Gaule et en Germanie (748-882)*.' H. Leclercq: 'Michel, *Histoire de l'Art*, I. 1.' Important.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique (Vol. VII. No. 2. April 1906. Louvain). P. Ladeuz: 'Apocryphes évangéliques coptes. Pseudo-Gamaliel: Évangile de Barthélemy.' M. Jacquin: 'La question de la prédestination aux V^e et VI^e siècles. III. S. Prosper d'Aquitaine—Vincent de Lérins—Cassien.' P. Fournier: 'Étude sur les Fausses Décrétales. II. Date de l'Œuvre d'Isidore.' P. Richard: 'Origines des nonciatures permanentes. II. La représentation pontificale au XV^e siècle.' Comptes Rendus. C. van Crombrughe: 'Berning, *Die Einsetzung d. hl. Eucharistie*' and 'Goetz, *Die Abendmahlsfrage*.' H. Coppieters: 'Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l'empire perse (224-632)*.' P. Delannoy: 'Vacandard, *Études de critique et d'histoire religieuses*.' J. Warichez: 'Monod, *Le moine Guibert et son temps (1053-1124)*.' L. Guilloreau: 'Gasquet, *Henry III. and the Church*.' M. Jacquin: 'Michael, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes vom XIII. Jahrhundert bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters*, II.-IV.' J. Laenen: 'Künstle, *Die deutsche Pfarrei und ihr Recht zu Ausgang des Mittelalters*' ('un luxe extraordinaire de documentation'). É. Tobac: 'Kalkoff, *Die Anfänge der Gegenreformation in den Niederlanden*.' C. Guédon: 'A. Lang, *Knox and the Reformation*.' A. Palmieri: 'Likowski, *Union zu Brest*.' A. Fierens: 'La question franciscaine.' H. C[oppieters]: 'W. Barry, *Tradition of Scripture*.' J. Simon: 'A. F. Pollard, *Henry VIII*.' 'H. Paul, *Life of Froude*.'

Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique (Nos. 4-6. April-June 1906. Paris: Lecoffre). J. Margreta: 'La philosophie religieuse de R. Eucken.' L. Saltet: 'Le schisme d'Antioche au IV^e siècle.' L. Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, I. May.—J. Baylac: 'Les états mystiques de S. Thérèse et la théorie du "subconscient".' 'H. Delehaye, *Les Légendes hagiographiques*.' 'Samaran-Mollat, *La fiscalité pontificale en France au XIV^e siècle*.' June.—P. Batiffol: 'Evolutionisme et histoire, à propos d'un article récent.' [Laberthonnière in *Annales de philos. chrét.* Feb. 1906.] A. Durand: 'C. Pesch, S.J., *De inspiratione sacrae scripturae*.' 'H. Bremond, *Newman, essai de biographie psychologique*.' 'L'expérience religieuse, d'après M. William James.'

Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature religieuses (Vol. XI. No. 2,

March-April 1906. Paris: Picard). P. de Labriolle: 'La polémique antimontaniste contre la prophétie extatique.' A. Diès: 'L'évolution de la théologie dans les philosophes grecs: II. De Pythagore à Empédocle.' L. Macaire: 'Déposition de la mère Angélique Arnauld sur les vertus de S. François de Sales.' P. Lejay: 'J. Leipoldt, *Schenute von Atripe*.' 'Bidez, *Deux versions grecques inédites de la Vie de Paul de Thèbes*.'

Analecta Bollandiana (Tom. XXV. 2. April 1906. Brussels). P. Peeters: 'La légende de Saïdnaia.' H. Delehay: 'Sanctus Silvanus.' A. Poncelet: 'Le Testament de S. Willibrord.' 'S. Expédit et le martyrologe hiéronymien.' A. Poncelet: 'Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum lat. bibliothec. Rom. praeterquam Vat., IV. Codd. Bibl. Alexandrinae.' P. [Peeters]: 'Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium: Scriptores aethiopici.' Forget, *Synaxarium Alexandrinum*, I. r. Texte arabe'; 'Medlycott, *India and the Apostle Thomas*.' H. D[elehay]: 'Allard, *Dix Leçons sur le Martyre*.' 'J. C. Oman, *Mystics, Ascetics and Saints of India*.' 'Rampolla, *S. Melania Giuniore*.' 'K. Rieder, *Der Gottesfreund vom Oberland. Eine Erfindung des Strassburger Johannitenbruders Nikolaus von Löwen*.' H. Moretus: 'J. C. Wall, *Shrines of British Saints*.' 'J. M. Williamson, *St. Boniface*.' A. P[oncelet]: 'Bury, *Life of St. Patrick*.' 'Healy, *Life of St. Patrick*.' F. V[an] O[rtruy]: 'R. Balfour, *The Seraphic Keepsake*.' 'Mortier, *Histoire des Maîtres Généraux de l'ordre des Frères Prêcheurs*. II. 1263-1323.' 'Perouse, *Le cardinal Louis Aleman, président du concile de Bâle et la fin du grand schisme*.' 'Bremond, Roper, Churton Collins, *Sir Thomas More*.'

Revue de l'Orient Chrétien. (N.S. Vol. I. No. 1. Paris: Picard). Mgr. A. Scher: 'Étude supplémentaire sur les écrivains syriens orientaux.' F. Bouvier: 'La Syrie à la veille de l'usurpation Tulunide avant 878.' E. Blochet: 'Les Monnaies mongoles de la collection Decourdemanche.' B. Evetts: 'Le rite copte de la prise d'habit et de la profession monacale.' MS. Bodl. copt. 111 (Saec. xiv.) Coptic text. F. Tournèze: 'Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie (suite): Les Frères-Unis de S. Grégoire l'Illuminateur.' E. Mangelot, 'L'origine espagnole du *Filioque*.' L. Delaporte: 'Note sur de nouveaux fragments sahidiques du *Pasteur d'Hermas*.' F. Nau: 'Une lettre du R. P. C. Bacha sur un nouveau MS. carchouni de la *Chronique* de Michel le syrien et sur Théodore Abou-Kurra.' E. Mangelot: 'K. Kunstle, *Antipriscilliana*.' 'Vacant-Mangelot, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*.' B. Evetts: 'G. Horner, *Service for the consecration of a Church and an Altar according to the Coptic rite*.' F. Nau: 'Basset, *Les Apocryphes éthiopiens traduits en français*.'

Revue des Questions Historiques (Vol. XL. No. 158. April 1906. Paris). J. Trésal: 'Les responsabilités de la France dans le schisme anglican.' Interesting. R. Ancel: 'La secrétairerie pontificale sous Paul IV.' E. Rodocanachi: 'Les esclaves en Italie du XIII^e au XVI^e siècle.' E. Dedé: 'Les pensions ecclésiastiques sous l'ancien régime et jusqu'au Concordat.' E. M. Rivière: 'La lettre du Christ tombée du ciel. Le MS. 208 de Toulouse.' E. Vacandard: 'Pierre de Colmieu, archevêque de Rouen, son pays d'origine.' J. Guiraud: 'La croisade des Albigeois.' A. Vogt: 'Diehl, *Études byzantines*,' et 'Pargoire, *L'Eglise byzantine (527-847)*.' J. Besse: 'Lesne, *La hiérarchie épiscopale en Gaule et Germanie (742-882)*.' Most favourable. P. Allard: 'A. J. Carlyle,

Mediaeval Political Theory in the West, I.' Favourable. H. Froidevaux : 'E. G. Bourne, *The American Nation*, III. (1450-1580).'

Studi Religiosi (Vol. VI. No. 2. March-April 1906. Florence). E. Pistelli : 'Papiri evangelici.' In the Museo Archeologico at Florence. With photographs. S. Minocchi : 'La nuova cultura del Clero : (1) Genesi degli studi religiosi moderni ; (2) La nuova Apologia del Cristianesimo.' A. Palmieri : 'Il Vecchio Cattolicismo e la Chiesa russa.' X. : 'Dei rapporti fra la Chiesa e lo Stato.' S. Minocchi : 'Storia e letteratura Francescana.' M. F. : 'Studi recenti sul Nuovo Testamento.' Hébert, *L'évolution de la foi catholique*. 'Weingarten-Arnold, *Zeittafeln*, IV^{te} Auflage.' Magistretti, *Manuale Ambrosianum*. 'Guetschon, *Innocenz III und England*.' S. Minocchi : 'Versione di Isaia xxx. 24-xxxviii. 9.'

Teologisk Tidsskrift (Vol. VII. No. 3. 1906. Copenhagen). A. G. S. Prior : 'Paulus's Evangelium.' J. P. Bang : 'Den Kristelige Erkendelse.' L. Koch : 'Om Symboler og Symbolforpligtelse.' F. Tonn : 'Blass, *Über die Textkritik im Neuen Testament*.'

The East and the West (Vol. IV. No. 14. April 1906. S.P.G.). Right Rev. W. E. Smyth (Bishop of Lebombo) : 'Christian Comity in the Mission Field.' G. A. Grierson : 'Hinduism and Early Christianity.' H. U. Weitbrecht : 'Missionary Professorships.' Right Rev. C. H. Boutflower (Bishop of Dorking) : 'What is Wrong?' W. Dawson, R.N. : 'Ecclesiastical Hydrophobia.' E. P. Sketchley : 'Dr. Bray and his Times.' T. Tatlow : 'The Student Christian Movement.' The Bishop of Lahore : 'Baptism behind the Purdah'; 'T. T. Cotton, *Inscriptions on Monuments in Madras*'; 'Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*'; 'Bishop Gibson of Capetown, *Between Capetown and Loanda*'; 'A. W. Robinson, *The Mission of Help to South Africa*'; 'E. H. Parker, *China and Religion*.'

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The more important will be reviewed or noticed in articles as space permits.

BIBLICAL STUDIES.

ADDIS, W. E.—*Hebrew Religion to the Establishment of Judaism under Ezra*. 'Crown Theological Library.' Pp. xvi + 316. (Williams and Norgate.) 5s.

BROOKE, A. E., AND McLEAN, N.—*The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of the Codex Vaticanus, supplemented from other Uncial MSS., with a critical Apparatus containing the variants of the chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the LXX. Part I. Genesis*. Pp. viii + 156. (Cambridge University Press.) Price 7s. 6d. Subscription price for Parts I.-IV. [Vol. I., *The Octateuch*], 6s. each net.

CHADWICK, W. E.—*The Social Teaching of St. Paul*. Pp. x + 160. (Cambridge University Press.) 3s. 6d.

COPELSTON, MOST REV. R. S. (BISHOP OF CALCUTTA).—*Notes on the Higher Criticism*. Being an Appendix to his Charge delivered in January 1905. Pp. 30. (S.P.C.K.) 3d. Too short to be useful.

DRIVER, S. R.—*The Book of Job in the Revised Version*. Edited with Introductions and brief Annotations. Pp. xxxvi + 134. (Clarendon Press.) 2s. 6d. net.

VOL. LXII.—NO. CXXIV.

K K

HOUTIN, A.—*La Question Biblique au XX^e Siècle*. Pp. xii + 294. (Paris : E. Nourry.) 4 francs.

JAMES, J. D.—*The Genuineness and Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles*. Pp. x + 166. (Longmans.) 3s. 6d. net.

JEFFREYS, L. D.—*Ancient Hebrew Names : Notes on their Significance and Historic Value*. With Preface by A. H. SAYCE. Pp. xiv + 186. (Nisbet.)

KIRKPATRICK, A. F., SWETE, H. B., KNOWLING, R. J., ROBERTSON, A., SANDAY, W., HEADLAM, A. C.—*Critical Questions*. Being a course of sermons delivered in St. Mark's Church, Marylebone Road, N.W. With a Preface by J. ADDERLEY. Second Edition. Pp. xii + 204. (Masters and Co.) 3s. net.

LIGHTFOOT, BISHOP (the late).—*Analysis of Certain of St. Paul's Epistles*. With Preface by the BISHOP OF DURHAM. Pp. vi + 76. (Macmillan.) 1s. net. Reprinted from the commentaries.

MOBERLY, W. A. (the late).—*The Old Testament in Modern Light*. With Preface by the BISHOP OF SOUTHWARK. Pp. 162. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. 6d.

MOFFATT, J.—*The Books of Judges and Ruth*. Pp. viii + 144. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 1s. 6d. net. An interesting little volume in the 'Literary Illustrations of the Bible' Series.

RICHMOND, W. J.—*The Gospel of the Rejection. A Study in the Relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Three*. Pp. xx + 186. (Murray.) 5s. net.

ROPES, J. R.—*The Apostolic Age in the Light of Modern Criticism*. Pp. x + 328. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s. net.

SEDGWICK, S. N.—*The Story of the Apocrypha : a Series of Lectures on the Books and Times of the Apocrypha*. Pp. 156. (S.P.C.K.) 2s.

SMYTH, J. PATERSON.—*How we got our Bible*. Pp. vi + 140. (S.P.C.K.) Eighteenth Edition. 6d. net.

WRIGHT, C. H. H.—*Daniel and its Critics : being a Critical and Grammatical Commentary*. Pp. xxxviii + 284. (Williams and Norgate.) 7s. 6d.

METAPHYSICS AND PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

DRAWBRIDGE, C. L.—*Is Religion Undermined?* Pp. x + 238. (Longmans.) 3s. 6d. net.

GWATKIN, H. M.—*The Knowledge of God and its Historical Development*. Two volumes. Pp. xii + 308, vi + 334. (Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark.) 12s. net. Gifford Lectures, 1904-5.

JEVONS, F. B.—*Religion in Evolution*. Pp. xii + 154. (Methuen.) 3s. 6d. net.

SMITH, GOLDWIN.—*In Quest of Light*. Pp. x + 178. (New York and London : The Macmillan Co.) 4s. net.

SMITH, I. GREGORY.—*What is Truth? An Attempt to Elucidate First Principles in Belief*. Pp. xx + 132. (J. Murray.) 5s. net.

STURT, H.—*Idola Theatri : a Criticism of Oxford Thought and Thinkers from the Standpoint of Personal Idealism*. Pp. xviii + 344. (Macmillan.) 10s. net.

TISDALL, W. ST. C.—*The Religion of the Crescent*. The 'James Long' Lectures on Muhammadanism. Pp. xvi + 252. (S.P.C.K.) 4s. Second Edition revised.

WALKER, W. L.—*Christian Theism and a Spiritual Monism ; God*

Freedom, and Immortality in View of Monistic Evolution. Pp. viii + 484. (T. and T. Clark.) 9s.

CHURCH HISTORY.

F. HER, G. P.—*The Reformation.* Pp. xxx + 524. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 10s. 6d. net. New and Revised Edition.

HUTTON, W. H.—*The Church and the Barbarians*, being an Outline of the History of the Church from A.D. 461 to A.D. 1003. 'The Church Universal, III.' Pp. viii + 228. (Rivingtons.) 3s. 6d. net.

LINDSAY, T. M.—*A History of the Reformation.* Vol. I. *The Reformation in Germany from its Beginning to the Religious Peace of Augsburg.* 'International Theological Library.' Pp. xvi + 528. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.) 12s.

OVERTON, J. H. (the late) and RELTON, F.—*The English Church from the Accession of George I. to the End of the Eighteenth Century* (1714-1800). Pp. xviii + 374. (Macmillan.) 7s. 6d.

DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY.

CURTIS, O. A.—*The Christian Faith personally given in a System of Doctrine.* Pp. xii + 542. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 10s. 6d. net.

FORREST, D. W.—*The Authority of Christ.* Pp. xx + 438. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.) 6s.

HERRMANN, W.—*The Communion of the Christian with God described on the Basis of Luther's Statements.* Second English Edition. Being the translation by J. S. STANYON, revised throughout and enlarged and altered in accordance with the Fourth German Edition of 1903 by R. W. STEWART. 'Crown Theological Library.' Pp. xviii + 350. (Williams and Norgate.) 5s.

MOEHLER, J. A.—*Symbolism or Exposition of the Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants as evidenced by their Symbolical Writings.* Translated by J. B. ROBERTSON. Pp. xxii + 516. (Gibbings and Co.) 6s. net. Fifth Edition.

ROBINSON, C. H.—*The Office and Work of the Holy Spirit: a Bible Study.* With an Introductory Note. Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K.) 1d.

THOMAS, W. H. G.—*The Catholic Faith. A Manual of Instruction for Members of the Church of England.* Second Edition. Pp. xxiv + 462. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 1s. net. From a Protestant standpoint.

LITURGICA.

ABRAHAM, W. H.—*The Position of the Eucharist in Sunday Worship.* Pp. xvi + 372. (Masters.) 5s. net.

O'LEARY, DE L.—*The Apostolical Constitutions and Cognate Documents, with Special Reference to their Liturgical Elements.* 'Early Church Classics.' Pp. 78. (S.P.C.K.) 1s.

DEVOTIONAL THEOLOGY.

BLUNT, E. M.—*Easter Joy.* Short Readings for the Great Forty Days. Pp. 90. (S.P.C.K.) 6d.

DE LA BROISE, R. M.—*Saint Mary the Virgin.* 'The Saints' Series. Translated by H. GIDNEY. Pp. xiv + 266. (Duckworth.) 3s. Translation of one of the well-known French series.

BROWN, C.—*The Letters of Christ*. Pp. 128. (J. Clarke and Co.) 1s. 6d. net. Studies in the 'Letters to the Seven Churches' (Rev. ii.—iii. 22).

HENSLOW, G.—*The Spiritual Teaching of Christ's Life*. Pp. 254. (Williams and Norgate.) 5s. net.

KNOCKER, W. G.—*Our Angel Guardians*. Pp. 94. (Skeffingtons.) 1s. 6d. net.

LEIGH, HON. A.—*Talks on the Beatitudes*. Pp. 68. (Wells Gardner.) 3d.

MAGEE, A. V.—*For the Sins of the Whole World: Thoughts on the Atonement*. Pp. 56. (Wells Gardner.) 3d.

MOORSOM, R. M.—*Some Neglected Prayers*. For Family and Private Use: for Retreats and Classes. Pp. 94. (Bemrose.) 1s. net.

PAYTON, J. W.—*The Communion: a Handbook to the Prayer Book Service*. With a Preface by C. BODINGTON. Pp. viii + 68. (Masters.) 2s.

POULAIN, A. (S.J.)—*Des Grâces d'Oraison: Traité de théologie mystique*. Cinquième édition revue et augmentée. Pp. xvi + 600. (Paris: V. Retaux.) 7 fr. 50.

— *L'Oraison de Simplicité: la première nuit de St. Jean de la Croix*. Pp. 106. (Paris: V. Retaux.) cc. ii and xv of the former work.

RANDOLPH, B. W. (Edited by).—*Letters and Reflections of Fénelon*. Pp. xii + 158. (Mowbray.) 1s. net.

VAUGHAN, J. (the late).—*Meditations for the Sick and Suffering*. Pp. 30. (S.P.C.K.) 4d.

A Day Book of Short Readings for Use by Busy People. By the Author of 'Praeparatio.' With Preface by G. CONGREVE, S.S.J.E. Advent to Trinity. Pp. xvi + 512. (Masters.) 6s. net.

The English Hymnal. Pp. xvi + 636. (Oxford: University Press.) 1s. net.

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

À KEMPIS, THOMAS.—*The Founders of the New Devotion; being the Lives of Gerard Groot, Florentius Radewin, and their Followers*. Translated by J. P. ARTHUR. Pp. xlviii + 268. (Kegan Paul.) 5s. net.

BEDWELL, C. E. A.—*The Increase of the Episcopate*. With an Introduction by the BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS. Pp. xii + 148. (Longmans.) 2s. 6d. net.

MATER, A.—*L'Église catholique: sa constitution, son administration*. Pp. iv. + 462. (Paris: Armand Colin.) 5 fr.

† MICHAEL, O. S.—*The Sunday School in the Development of the American Church*. Pp. 294. (Milwaukee: Young Churchman Co.) 6s. 6d. net.

PEAKE, A. S.—*Reform in Sunday School Teaching*. Pp. 128. (J. Clarke & Co.) 1s. 6d. net.

RIDDING, LADY LAURA (edited by).—*The Church and Commonwealth. The Visitation Charges of the Right Rev. GEORGE RIDDING, D.D., first Bishop of Southwell*. Pp. xii + 332. (E. Arnold.) 10s. 6d. net.

TYRRELL, G.—*Lex Credendi: a Sequel to Lex Orandi*. Pp. xviii + 256. (Longmans.) 5s. net.

WALPOLE, G. H. S.—*Personality and Power, or the Secret of Real Influence*. Pp. viii + 188. (Elliot Stock.) 2s. 6d. net.

SERMONS AND ADDRESSES.

BECK, W.—*The Sacraments of the Gospel: Lecture Addresses*. Pp. 114. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. 6d.

CHURCH, DEAN (the late).—*The Christian Church*. Pp. 30. (S.P.C.K.) 2d. Reprinted from *Oxford House Papers* (Second Series).

GRUNDY, C. H.—*Luncheon Lectures at St. Paul's Cathedral*. Pp. 68. (Elliot Stock.) 1s. net.

HANKEY, W. B. (the late).—*Holy Week Addresses*. Edited by W. J. BIRKBECK. With Short Memoir by VISCOUNT HALIFAX. Pp. xii + 132. (Mowbray.) 1s. net.

HARRISON, A. R.—*St. Paul and his Ship*. Three Sermons preached in the Parish Church of Stratford-on-Avon, Lent 1905. Pp. viii + 38. (Skeffingtons.) 1s. net.

HORNE, C. S.—*The Relationships of Life*. Pp. 156. (Allenson.) 1s. 6d. net.

INGE, W. R.—*Studies of English Mystics*. *St. Margaret's Lectures* 1905. Pp. viii + 240. (Murray.) 6s. net.

LEFROY, RIGHT REV. G. A. (BISHOP OF LAHORE).—*Sweeps and Bridge*. Two Sermons preached in Christ Church, Simla, Aug. 13, 20, 1905. Pp. 62. (S.P.C.K.) 6d.

MITCHINSON, RIGHT REV. J.—*The Great Commandment and the Second like unto it*. Six Sermons preached before the University of Oxford as Select Preacher. Pp. 116. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. 6d.

RANDOLPH, B. W.—*The Empty Tomb, being Thoughts on the Resurrection of our Lord*. Pp. xx + 56. (Longmans.) 2s. net.

RAWNSLEY, R. D. B. (the late).—*Village Sermons*. Third Series. 'Sermon Library,' III. Pp. xii + 204. (Skeffingtons.) 2s. net.

SAYCE, A. H.—*The Preaching of St. Paul*. Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K.) 1d. Delivered at All Saints, Cairo.

TUGMAN, E. A.—*Addresses to Women*. Pp. viii + 90. (Masters.) 2s. 6d.

VAN-DYKE, H.—*Manhood, Faith, and Courage*. Pp. xvi + 254. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 5s.

WALPOLE, G. H. S.—*The Mission of the Holy Ghost*. Pp. viii + 104. (Longmans.) 2s. net.

WHITWORTH, W. ALLEN (the late).—*Christian Thought on Present-day Questions*. Sermons on Special Occasions. With Preface by the BISHOP OF LONDON. Pp. x + 214. (Macmillan.) 4s. 6d. net.

WINNINGTON-INGRAM, RIGHT REV. A. F. (BISHOP OF LONDON).—*The Gospel in Action*. Pp. x + 324. (Wells Gardner.) 3s. 6d.

— *A Mission of the Spirit*. Pp. viii + 222. (Wells Gardner.) 2s. 6d.

Harvest Sermons. Being XXII. Plain Sermons for Harvest Thanksgiving Services in Towns and Villages. 'Sermon Library,' IV. Pp. xii + 72. (Skeffingtons.) 2s. net. By various Authors, including Dean Ridgeway, Preb. H. J. Wilmot-Buxton, Canon Atherton, Rev. S. Baring-Gould, etc.

Plain Sermons for the Christian Year. By various Contributors. New Series. V. Trinity Sunday until Eighth Sunday after Trinity. Pp. iv + 240. (S.P.C.K.) 1s.

MEDIEVAL AND MODERN HISTORY, ARCHÆOLOGY AND ANTIQUITIES.

The Cambridge Modern History. Vol. IX. *Napoleon*. Pp. xxviii + 948. (Cambridge University Press.) 16s. net.

BLOOM, J. H.—*English Seals*. Pp. xvi + 274. (Methuen.) 7s. 6d. net. With 93 Illustrations.

BRODRICK, G. C. (the late) and FOTHERINGHAM, J. K.—*The History of England from Addington's Administration to the Close of William IV.'s Reign (1801-1837)*, 'Political History,' Vol. XI. Pp. xx + 486. (Longmans.) 7s. 6d. net.

JEANS, G. E. (edited by).—*Memorials of Old Hampshire*. Pp. xiv + 288. (Bemrose.) 15s. net.

MACALISTER, R. A. S.—*Bible Side-Lights from the Mound of Gezer: a Record of Excavation and Discovery in Palestine*. Pp. xii + 232. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 5s. With Illustrations.

THYNNE, A. C.—*A Brief History of Kilhampton Church and Parish*. Pp. viii + 48. (Wells Gardner.) 1s. net.

WHEELER, L.—*Chertsey Abbey: an Existence of the Past*. With Preface by SIR S. EADY. Pp. xvi + 232. (Wells Gardner.) 5s. net.

EDUCATION.

CREIGHTON, BISHOP (the late).—*Thoughts on Education*. Edited by L. CREIGHTON. Cheap Edition, abridged. With Introduction by the BISHOP of MANCHESTER. Pp. xxx + 105. (Longmans.) 6d. net.

EGERTON, H.—*A Plea for Church Schools*. Pp. 46. (G. Allen.) 6d. net.
The Education Bill, 1906. The Withdrawal of Schools: Notes on the Trust Deeds of Voluntary Schools. Pp. 32. Printed for the Church Schools' Emergency League. Leaflet No. XLIII. (Manchester: J. Verity.) 6d.

GORE, RIGHT REV. C. (BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM).—*Objections to the Education Bill 1906 in Principle and in Detail*. Pp. 28. (Murray.) 6d. net.

HENSON, H. H.—*Religion in the Schools: Addresses on Fundamental Christianity*. Delivered in St. Margaret's, Westminster, during Lent 1906. Pp. xx + 138. (Macmillan.) 2s. 6d. net.

LANG, RIGHT REV. C. G. (BISHOP OF STEPNEY).—*The Principles of Religious Education*. Three Sermons preached in St. Paul's Cathedral. Pp. 32. (Longmans.) 3d. net.

The Education Bill, 1906: A Bill to Crush Church Schools. Emergency Leaflet XLIV. Pp. 36. (Church Schools' Emergency League.) 4d.

WORDSWORTH, RIGHT REV. J. (BISHOP OF SALISBURY).—*The Education Question*. Synod Address and Three Lectures. Pp. 76. (Longmans.) 1s. net.

BIOGRAPHY.

CLAYTON, J.—*Bishop Westcott*. 'Leaders of the Church, 1800-1900.' Pp. xii + 192. (Mowbray.) 3s. 6d. net.

FITCHETT, W. H.—*Wesley and his Century: a Study in Spiritual Forces*. Pp. viii + 538. (Smith, Elder and Co.) 6s. net.

ROSCOE, SIR H. E.—*The Life and Experiences of Sir Henry Enfield Roscoe, D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S.* Pp. xii + 420. (Macmillan.) 12s. net.

ST. CYRES, VISCOUNT.—*The Life of François de Fénelon*. Pp. viii + 208. (Methuen.) 2s. 6d. net. Abridgment of the Author's larger work on Fénelon.

GENERAL LITERATURE.

BENN, A. W.—*A History of English Rationalism in the Nineteenth*

Century. Two Volumes. Pp. xxviii + 450, xii + 534. (Longmans.) 21s. net.

BENSON, A. C.—*Walter Pater*. 'English Men of Letters' Series. Pp. viii + 226. (Macmillan.) 2s. net.

CARPENTER, E.—*Days with Walt Whitman, with some Notes on his Life and Work*. Pp. viii + 188. (G. Allen.) 5s. net.

CHURCHILL, W.—*Coniston*. Pp. xiv + 544. (Macmillan.) 6s.

COUTTS, F.—*The Song of Songs*. A Lyrical Folk-Play of the ancient Hebrews arranged in vii. scenes. With illustrations by H. OSPOVAT. Pp. 68. (John Lane.) 1s. net.

D'ARCY, G. J. A.—*St. Aidan, Apostle of England*. A dramatic Tragedy in two Acts. Pp. viii + 60. (Skeffingtons.) 1s. net. The third of a Trilogy (St. Patrick, St. Columba, St. Aidan), intended for acting. Music by the Rev. LESTER PINCHARD.

DIMNET, E.—*La Pensée Catholique dans l'Angleterre contemporaine*. Pp. xxxii + 314. (Paris: Lecoffre.) 3 fr. 50.

GRIER, S. C.—*The Letters of Warren Hastings to his Wife, transcribed in full from the Originals in the British Museum*. Introduced and Annotated. Pp. viii + 484. (Blackwood.) 16s. net.

HAND, J. E. (edited by).—*Science in Public Affairs*. With Preface by R. B. HALDANE. Pp. xxiv + 292. (G. Allen.) 5s. net.

LATREILLE, C.—*Joseph de Maistre et la Papauté*. Avec deux gravures et deux fac-similés. Pp. xx + 360. (Paris: Hachette.) 3 fr. 50.

LOLIEE, F.—*A Short History of Comparative Literature from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*. Translated by M. D. POWER. Pp. xii + 382. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s. net.

LUBBOCK, P.—*Elizabeth Barrett Browning in her Letters*. Pp. vi + 382. (Smith, Elder and Co.) 7s. 6d. net.

MOLESWORTH, M. L.—*The Wrong Envelope and other Stories*. Pp. viii + 248. (Macmillan.) 6s.

MORE, A. C.—*Radia, or New Light on Old Truths*. Pp. vi + 188. (Elliot Stock.) 3s. 6d. net. A Poem.

NOEL, C.—*The Labour Party: What it is. What it wants*. Pp. v + 180. (T. Fisher Unwin.) 1s. net.

SABATIER, P.—*Disestablishment in France*. With a Preface by the translator, R. DELL, and the French-English text of the Separation Law, with Notes. Pp. 174. (T. Fisher Unwin.) 3s. 6d. net. A useful book.

SAINTSBURY, G.—*A History of English Prosody from the Twelfth Century to the Present Day*. Vol. I. *From the Origins to Spenser*. Pp. xviii + 428. (Macmillan.) 10s. net.

SANDBERG, G. (the late).—*Tibet and the Tibetans*. Pp. x + 334. (S.P.C.K.) 5s.

STEVENSON, M.—*The Spiritual Teaching of Longfellow*. Pp. x + 90. (Wells Gardner.) 2s. 6d.

TOLSTOY, L.—*A Great Iniquity*. Translated by V. TCHERTKOFF and I. F. MAYO, with a Note. Pp. iv + 40. (Free Age Press.) 4d. net.

——— *The One Thing Needful*. Translated by the same. Pp. iv + 56. (London: Free Age Press.) 4d. net.

TREVES, SIR F.—*Highways and Byways in Dorset*. Pp. xx + 376. (Macmillan.) 6s.

VERRALL, A. W.—*Four Plays of Euripides: Andromache, Helen, Heracles, Orestes*. Pp. xii + 292. (Cambridge University Press.) 7s. 6d. net.

WELLS, J.—*The Oxford Degree Ceremony*. Pp. viii + 98. (Oxford University Press.) 1s. 6d. net. A delightful little book.

WISTER, O.—*Lady Baltimore*. Pp. xiv + 406. (Macmillan.) 6s. A charming, if unexciting, picture of life and manners in S. Carolina in the generation after the War.

Little Flowers of a Childhood: the Record of a Child. Pp. xvi + 168. (De La More Press.) 3s. 6d. net. A touching little story of a child who died at the age of four.

The Lady of the Decoration. Pp. iv + 250. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s. A Series of Letters.

The Religious Opinions of Elizabeth Barrett Browning. As expressed in Three Letters addressed to Wm. Merry, Esq., J.P. Pp. 56. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 2s. 6d. net.

MISCELLANEOUS.

DAVISON, A. W.—*Derby: its Rise and Progress*. Pp. x + 342. (Bemrose.) 5s.

HILLIER, E. J.—*On the Question of a Revision of the Book of Common Prayer*. Pp. 12. (Elliot Stock.) 3d. Suggests the removal of all passages which disagree with the writer's views of science and his Protestant (Zwinglian) theology.

HOARE, H. W.—*The Disestablishment Question at the Present Time*. An Address. Pp. 62. (S.P.C.K.) 6d.

'KATE, MOTHER.'—*Old Soho Days and other Memories*. With Preface by S. D. HEADLAM. Pp. xii + 216. (Mowbray.) 2s. 6d. net.

SMITH, C. W.—*International, Commercial, and Financial Gambling in 'Options and Futures' (March's à Terme) the Economic Ruin of the World*. Pp. xiv + 340. (P. S. King.) 5s. net.

TYNAN, K.—*A Book of Memory: the Birthday Book of the Blessed Dead*. Pp. xii + 216. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s. net. A most beautiful book, two days to the page.

'UPSILON.'—*The Veil of Truth*. Pp. 64. (Routledge.) 1s.

'Z.'—*A Soul's Wayfaring*. A series of interviews with 'Romanus,' formerly an Anglican Rector. Pp. 300. (Bristol: Arrowsmith.) 3s. 6d. An unpleasant study in morbid psychology.

Report of the 'Sunday' (National Observance) Advisory Committee appointed, October 1905, by the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. Pp. 64. (S.P.C.K.)

The Diocese of Southwark: being a short Account of the History, Character and Needs of South London and other Parts of the Diocese. Issued by Authority of the Southwark Diocesan and South London Church Fund. Pp. 156. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. A useful and interesting little book.

Notes on Africa for Missionary Students. Pp. ii + 86. (C.M.S.) 1s.

Contrasts in the Campaign. By Various Writers. Pp. 204. (C.M.S.) 1s. 6d.

The Official Year-Book of the Church of England, 1906. Pp. xl + 652. (S.P.C.K.) 3s.

INDEX TO VOL. LXII.

ABB

- ABBOTT, Rev. Dr. E. A., *Johanne Grammar*, 434
 Adams, Prof. G. B., *The History of England from the Norman Conquest to the death of John*, 184
 Ainger, (the late) Canon, *Lectures and Essays*, 478
 Aitken, Rev. J., *The Book of Job*, 169
 Allen, Mr. J. R., *Celtic Art in Pagan and Christian Times*, 463
Antiquities, A Guide to the Early Christian and Byzantine (British Museum), 460

BACK to the Land, 249 *sqq.*: the prospect conjured up by this cry, 249; influx to the towns from rural districts is an evil not peculiar to England, 250; the agricultural problem in New York State: number of abandoned farms, 251; movement of farmers from the older parts of Canada, *ib.*; number of immigrants to replace them, 252; some causes of decline of agriculture in England, 253; the unemployed question: statistics supplied by the Distress Committees, 254; need of classification shewn, 255; growth of industrial villages, *ib.*; the real object of the workers in moving from one place to another, 256; free circulation of labour is a necessity, 257; requirements springing out of this: control needed over the growth of towns, 258; Mrs. Barnett's 'Garden

CHU

- Suburb' proposition, 259; practicability of the creation of industrial communities in the country: examples, 260; the 'First Garden City' at Letchworth, 261; considerations about the reorganization of agriculture, 262; difficulties to be met, 263; suggestions of Mr. Sennett (*Garden Cities in Theory and Practice*), 264; Mr. Rider Haggard's scheme for a 'National Land Settlement,' 265; appraisal of the Salvation Army Colonies: Hadleigh, cost and results, 265 *sq.*; the attempts at Fort Romie and Fort Amity (California), Fort Herrick (Ohio), 266 *sq.*; some encouraging results, 267; the treatment of habitual vagrants, 268; the mischief of 'indiscriminate dole-giving,' 269; summary of recommendations, 270
 Bacon, Rev. Dr. B. W., *The Story of St. Paul*, 171
 Ballard, Rev. Frank, *Haeckel's Monism False*, 222
 Beeching, Rev. Canon, *The Grace of Episcopacy* (Sermons), 467
 Beet, Rev. Dr. J. Agar, *The Last Things*, 444
 Books received, Notes on, 243, 489
 Burn, Rev. A. E., *Niceta of Remesiana*, 174
 CARTER, Mr. J. B., *The Religion of Numa*, 204
Christian Apologetics (by various writers: ed. W. W. Seton), 218
 Church Reform, III. *Training*

CLA

for *Holy Orders*, 1 *sqq.*: need of a definite standard for testing candidates, 2; Anglican lack of systematic training contrasted with the rules of other religious bodies, 3; hard-and-fast rules deprecated, 4; relations of bishops with candidates in the Georgian period compared with those now general, 5; subjects and methods of present-day examination tests, 6; these are not an ideal test for a candidate for ordination, 7; difficulties in the way of any serious study of Theology, 8; Dr. Swete's (Cambridge) proposed reform: drawbacks to his scheme, 9; the course now pursued at London University, 10; position of the theological colleges open only to graduates, 11; non-graduate colleges: the Central Entrance Examination, 12; suggested uniform standard for estimating qualifications of candidates for Holy Orders, 12 *sq.*; desiderated improvements in the theological colleges, 13; establishment of a Board of Clerical Education suggested, 14; the suggestions made would not lessen the Bishops' responsibility, 15; an illustrative typical examination paper, *ib.*; the candidate's last months before ordination, 16; the training of deacons: wrong use of the time of the diaconate, 17; the training of a clergyman contrasted with that of a medical man, 18; coming changes in our educational system: how they may affect clerical education, and how they must be met, 18 *sq.*; good work in this direction done in various seats of learning, 19; sketch of the work of the suggested Council, 20

Clayton, Mr. J., *Bishop Westcott* ('Leaders of the Church, 1800-1900'), 472

Coles, Rev. V. S. S., *Pastoral Work in Country Districts*, 215

Coptic, The New Testament in, 292 *sqq.*: survey of the work of the

CUS

editor (the Rev. George Horner), 293; palaeographical difficulties, 294; value of prayers attached to MSS., *ib.*; the basis of Mr. Horner's printed text: some criticism, 295; number of MSS. he has collated, 296; merits of his English translation, 297; the way in which a Coptic literature arose, 298; the Christian communities of Egypt, 299; the first evidence for the existence of Coptic Christians, 300; nationality of the inmates of the oldest monasteries of Egypt, 301; *provenance* of the first Coptic Biblical versions: the Sahidic, 302; whence it arose, 303; extent of its value, 304; account of the Akhmimic version, 305; its contents, 306; the Fayyomic version: its home and *raison d'être*, 307; problems that it presents: literary and textual, 308; the place occupied by the Bohairic version in relation to the other three, 309; period when a Bohairic literature arose, *ib.*; date of its oldest Biblical manuscripts, 310; argument from philology and history of the Egyptian language, 311; cause of the presence of 'alien words' in it, 312; reaction and purification, *ib.*; reasons why the Bohairic is valuable for textual criticism, 313; its instructive glosses, 314; their sources, 315; the languages referred to by the scribes, 316; critical value of the Bohairic version, apart from the glosses: two types of text compared, 316 *sq.*; which Greek text the original form of the Bohairic version represents, 319; value of the version for the history of the Canon, 320; possible aids from the Coptic translations of the O. T. to the restoration of the oldest Septuagint text, 322

Cox, Dr. J. C., *The Royal Forests of England*, 230

Crichton-Browne, Sir J., *Materialism*, 224

Cusa, Nicolas of, Cardinal and Reformer, 120 *sqq.*: his family

DAV

name, Nicolas Krebs (of Cues), 121; at school at Deventer (the Brothers of the Common Life), *ib.*; at Padua: his encyclopædic studies, 122; his powers as a preacher, *ib.*; position in the Council of Basel, 123; object of his work *De Concordantia Catholica*, 124; denies the inherent Primacy of the Pope, 125; the powers and rights of General Councils, 126; the pretended Donation of Constantine, 126 *n.*; 'the Pope is inferior to the Council,' 127; opinions of Cesarini and of Aeneas Sylvius, *ib.*; inconsistencies in Cusa's arguments: his tergiversation, 128; character of Aeneas Sylvius, 129; Cusa's embassy to Constantinople, 129 *sq.*; his philosophical writings: *De Docta Ignorantia*, 130; his influence on Giordano Bruno and on Leibnitz, *ib.*; the claim that he was the first mediæval writer to enunciate the theory of the motion of the earth, 131; the real object of *De Docta Ignorantia*, 133; Cusa's defence of the Papacy in the contests between Rome and Germany, 133 *sq.*; made Cardinal: appointed to visit and reform the German clergy, 135; account of his journey of visitation, 136 *sq.*; reform work in the Netherlands, 138; his scheme of General Reformation of the Church, 140; his difficulties as Bishop of Brixen, 141; the recalcitrant nuns of Sonnenburg, 142; Archduke Sigismund arrests Cusa, 143; Gregory of Heimburg's abusive attack on Cusa, 144; an interdict from Rome, 145; end of the struggle: Cusa's death, 146; his will, *ib.*; general estimate of his character, 146 *sq.*

DAVIS, Mr. H. W. C., *England under the Normans and Angevins*, 184

Dillon, Prof. E. J., *The Original Poem of Job*, 169

FIS

EDUCATION and Politics, 403
sqq.: the late Government's work for education, 404; religious liberty introduced into education by the Act of 1902, 405; the present Government's intentions: mischievous interference with Universities, 407; and with religious teaching in secondary schools, 408; examination of the new Bill: complete control granted to the local authority, 410; the Bill endows one particular form of religious instruction — undenominationalism, 412; the Bill starts from an utterly wrong principle, and so must fail, 413; violation of Trust Deeds, 414; why the bulk of the working classes are secularists, 415; objections to a secular system of education, 416; parents' rights as to religious education of children, 417; suggestions for carrying out this principle, 418; as to the teachers, 419; the future of the present non-provided schools, 420; the Church cannot accept undenominational teaching, 421; popular objection to 'sacerdotal teaching,' 422; the teaching which must be insisted on, 424; the practical action to be taken, 426; the clergy's policy in the future, 428

Eusebius, *The Bodleian MS. of Jerome's Version of the Chronicle of*, in Collotype (ed. J. K. Fotheringham), 179

Evans, Mr. H. A., *Highways and Byways in Oxford and the Cotswolds*, 227

Evetts, Mr. B., *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria* (Part II.), 450

FELTOE, Rev. C. L., *The Letters and other Remains of Dionysius of Alexandria*, 178

Firth, Mr. J. B., *Highways and Byways in Derbyshire*, 229

Fison, Mr. L., *Tales from Old Fiji*, 205

FLE

- Fleming, Dr. J. A., *The Evidence of Things Not Seen*, 220
 Fogazzaro, Antonio, *Il Santo: Romanzo*, 476
 Fouard, Abbé, *St. John and the End of the Apostolic Age*, 437
 Frazer, Dr. J. G., *The Early History of the Kingship*, 206
 Freeman, E. A., *Western Europe in the Fifth Century*, and . . . *in the Eighth Century* (2 vols.), 182
 Frere, Rev. W. H., *A History of the English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I.*, 193

GALLOWAY, Rev. G., *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion*, 224

- Garnier, Col. J., *The Worship of the Dead*, 207
 Gasquet, Abbot, *Some Letters of St. Bernard*, 181
 Gerard, Rev. J., *The Old Riddle and the Newest Answer*, 221

HENSLOW, Rev. Prof., *Present-day Rationalism critically Examined*, 220

- Holden, W. W., *Pro Christo*, 217
 Hunt, Dr. W., *The Political History of England* (Vol. X.), 196
 Hutton, Rev. W. H., *Burford Papers*, 477

INSKIP, Rev. J. T., *The Pastoral Idea*, 209

JOHNSON, J. B., *Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*, 445

- Jordan, L. H., *Comparative Religion: its Genesis and Growth*, 207
 Jowett, Rev. J. H., *The Epistles of St. Peter*, 441

KENNEDY, Dr. H. A. A., *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, 442

Knowing, Rev. Dr., *Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*, 438

LACEY, Rev. T. A., *The Historic Christ*, 173

Lang, Bishop (Stepney), *The Opportunity of the Church of England*, 212

MED

Lang, Mr. A., *John Knox and the Reformation*, 191

Lathbury, Mr. D. C., *Dean Church* ('Leaders of the Church, 1800-1900'), 472

Liberal Theology, III., 381 *sqq.*: a community of character between Christian and non-Christian history, 381; Christianity not co-ordinate with other religions, 382; why it is essentially divine, 383; God's nature is inscrutable: His character is not unintelligible, 384; the human spirit in Christian history, 385; Catholic Christians and the Bible, 386; Christian theology and the conception of development, 387; man has a spiritual nature which is dependent on God, 388; Haeckel's Pan-psychism criticised, 389; the real foundation of Christianity, 391; what the Christian *credenda* meant to our fathers in the Faith, 392; in what sense Christian belief is an historical development, 393; the full meaning of 'Back to Christ!' 394; the foundation of life must rest on Truth, 395; the good life as a practical ideal, 396; the Christian revelation is a revelation of *truth*, operative unto salvation, 397; seeming archaisms in the Church's definitions, 398; what constitutes the primary deposit committed to her, 399; diversities of Christian thought, 400; the real value of the Christian Scriptures, 401; the Divine purpose of our Lord's commission of authority to the Church, 403
 Lock, Rev. Dr., *The Bible and Christian Life*, 467
 Lucas, Mr. E. V., *Highways and Byways in Sussex*, 225

MACCUNN, Mrs. F., *Mary Stuart*, 191

McNeile, Rev. A. H., *An Introduction to Ecclesiastes*, 433

Mediaeval Monastic Libraries at Canterbury and elsewhere, 43 *sqq.*: modern indifference to the question of the old monastic life,

MED

44; ludicrous errors of writers in regard to that life, 45; aroused interest of archaeologists of our own day, *ib.*; investigations by Prof. Willis and by Mr. St. John Hope, 46; Dr. Jessopp's *Day in a Mediæval Monastery*, *ib.*; the manifold variety of the daily occupations of monks: manual labour, 47; the church and its services, the *Scriptorium*, 48; private reading enjoined on the brethren, *ib.*; the Library: its material structure, 49; Dr. Montague James' account of Archbishop Parker's library (C.C.C. Cambridge), 50; his work on the *Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover*: the catalogues thereof, 51; details of the stages of history of these collections, 52 *sqq.*; what the monks were reading in about 1170, 53; arrangement of the library in about 1300, 55; the number of volumes, 56; Prior Selling's (1472-94) care of the library built by Chichele, 57; the library and its contents in 1508, 58; a glimpse into mediæval library management, 59; library of Canterbury College, Oxford, 60; catalogue of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, 61; book-cases and shelves, 62; total number of works and *provenance* of MSS., 63; library of Dover Priory: John Whytefeld's (1389) catalogue, 64; analysis of the works contained in the three libraries: Bibles, 65; patristic works, Rules of Orders, natural science, 66; biography, music, geometry, astronomy, 67; medicine, logic, grammar, 68; Greek writers, Latin poets, 69 *sq.*; Latin prose writers, Roman and canon law, 70; French romances, 71; some criticisms on Dr. James' work, 72; fate of the two Canterbury libraries at the Dissolution, 73
 Medlycott, Bishop (Tricomia), *India and the Apostle Thomas*, 447
 Minocchi, Padre Salvatore, *I Salmi*, 166

MYS

Modern Maidens, To (by 'A Modern Matron'), 474
Mohammed and the Rise of Islam (Prof. Margoliouth's work), 357 *sqq.*: difficulties of the task of a biographer of Muhammad, 357; estimate of various efforts at such a Life, 358; works on the Qur'an, 360; discovery of new evidential materials for the Life of Muhammad and the study of the Qur'an, 361; antecedent conditions and early development of Islam, 362; estimate of English translations of the Qur'an, 363; there exists in no language an adequate translation, 364; Prof. Margoliouth's fitness for the task he has undertaken, 365; analysis of his work, 366; his estimate of Muhammad, 367; criticism of his views, 368; condition of contemporary Arabia: Muhammad was the child of a very extraordinary time, 369; the Arab search for an answer to the riddle of life, 370; Muhammad's personality: he was a *Kahin* (soothsayer), 371; what that means, 372; in *earlier life* he was actuated by genuine piety, 373; Prof. Margoliouth's inadequate reading of Muhammad, 375; the usual defence of Muhammad's numerous marriages, 377; Muslim views about sexual matters, 378
 Munro, Dr. R., *Archæology and False Antiquities*, 454
 Mysticism and Discipline (Rev. Dr. Bigg's *Unity in Diversity*), 322 *sqq.*; analysis of the work: the fundamental difference between St. Peter (the pastor and Disciplinarian) and St. Paul (the prophet and Mystic), 323; need of a mutual readjustment of Discipline and Mysticism, *ib.*; the relationship of the two tendencies in religious life, 324; Diversity is the warp, Unity the woof, of the web of creation, *ib.*; Dr. Bigg's estimate of St. Paul's teaching as the expounder of Unity, 325; his view of the

NIC

Gospel as a spiritual deliverance from legalism, 326; St. Peter's view: obedience and subjection, *ib.*; Dr. Bigg's treatment of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 327; Dr. Bigg's illustrations of his views from Church history, 328; his advice towards attaining Unity, *ib.*; signs of reaction among various bodies of Christians, 330; value of works of Catholic Mystics, 331; some present-day forms of Mysticism, 332; Miss Gregory's *Introduction to Christian Mysticism*: its value, 333

NICOLAS of Cusa, Cardinal.

See Cusa

Nyasaland, Missions in, II. *Anglican Missions*, 98 *sqq.*: the Universities' Mission: its headquarters (Likoma), 99; geography of the diocese of Likoma, *ib.*; the question of overlapping spheres, 100; relations of the Mission with Missions of other religious bodies, 101; results of a great movement of population, 102; community life of members of the Mission: they are all unmarried, 103; first stages in teaching the heathen: use of the Old Testament, 104; the African's introduction to God's *kamu* (= family), and to the New Testament, 105; his preparation for Baptism, Confirmation, and Communion, 105 *sq.*; his training in useful industries and trades, 107; sketch of Archdeacon Johnson's 'diffused' method of Mission work, 108; relations with the native chiefs, and with the people, 109 *sq.*; the Mission's freedom from all political influence, 111; the *raison d'être* of the several stations, 112; the work done on the island of Likoma, 113; estimate of results: numbers, baptisms of infants, 114; the position of women, 115; marriage, polygamy, widows, 115 *sq.*;

POR

Universities' Mission's translation of the Bible, 116; need of more workers: qualities necessary in candidates, 117; hopeful prospects — growth of native agents, 118

PAUL, Mr. Herbert, *A History of Modern England* (vols. III., IV.), 199

Peake, Prof. A. S., *The Book of Job*, 169

Penitence and Moral Discipline, 147 *sqq.*: two views as to the purpose of Confession (Bishop Churton's *The Use of Penitence*, and Canon Henson's *Moral Discipline in the Christian Church*, 147; the meaning of Redemption, 148; the effect of sin and the purpose of penitence, 149; regeneration and the development of the new Life, 150; the Church's duty towards sinners, *ib.*; criticism of the popular language about the imputation to us of Christ's merits, 151; the Church's commission to forgive, 152; what was the value of this absolution? 153; the two views of Bishop Churton and Canon Henson, *ib.*; the true meaning of our Lord's commission on Easter night, 154; a point in the English Ordinal explained, 155; the beginnings of voluntary confession of secret sins, 156; purpose of the ordinance of confession, 157; a distinction between grave and venial sin, 159; discretion required in its application, 160; denunciation of modern Roman casuistry, 161; Canon Henson's objection to methods of English confessors, 162; qualifications necessary for a confessor, 163; comparison of the two views of the writers under consideration, 164 *sq.*

Periodicals, 232, 480

Pooler, Rev. Canon, *Studies in the Religion of Israel*, 168

Porritt, Mr. Norman, *Religion and Health: their Mutual Relationship and Influence*, 480

PRE

Pre-Raphaelitism (Mr. Holman Hunt's work), 21 *sqq.*: old cavils at the Pre-Raphaelites, 22; the original members of the Brotherhood: its first principle, 23; origin of the name, 24; Rossetti and Ford Madox Brown, 24 *sq.*; a revolt against authority in art, 25; Holman Hunt's career, 26; his early friendship with Millais, 27; with Rossetti, 28; first displays of pictures by the 'P. R. B.' *ib.*; 'rancorous criticism' and hostility, 29; Hunt encouraged by Millais and others, *ib.*; work praised by Ruskin, 30; the 'P. R. B.'s' method of working, *ib.*; Hunt's account of 'The Light of the World,' 31; T. Carlyle's criticism of it, 32 *sq.*; Hunt's visit to the East: 'The Scapegoat,' 34; condition of the Brotherhood on his return, 35; Millais' views about his own later work, *ib.*; appreciation of Hunt's work by brother artists, 36; in Venice: Ruskin, 37; in Jerusalem: 'The Shadow of the Cross,' 38; difficulties in the painting of 'The Flight into Egypt,' 39; Ruskin's description of the painter's purpose, *ib.*; Hunt's denunciation of 'the foreign schools': Impressionism, 40; the object of his book, 41; his plea for an English national art, 42

REDFERN, James, Sculptor, 334 *sqq.*: his boyhood: early efforts in carving and drawing, 335; his first patrons, 336; helped and encouraged by Mr. Beresford-Hope, 338; a pupil of Mr. J. Clayton, 339; an art-student in Paris, 340; the Tractarian movement and Gothic revival: their influence on Redfern's career, 341; taste for sculpture in the mediæval manner, 343; description of some of his works, 344; his marriage, 345; works in St. Andrew's, Well Street: the reredos, 346; work on the Albert Memorial, 347;

TEM

the font of Inverness Cathedral and a replica in New York, 348; coloured stone sculpture, 349; association with Mr. Street and Sir Gilbert Scott, 350; work on the decoration of Ely, Salisbury, and Gloucester cathedrals, 351; amazing amount of his work, 352; the dispute about his figures for Bristol Cathedral, 353; his death, 355; his brother-artists' respect for him, 356

Robertson, Bishop (Exeter), *English Churchmanship* (Charge), 465

Rogers, Rev. C. F., *Principles of Parish Work*, 212

Russell, Mr. G. W. E., *Canon Liddon* ('Leaders of the Church, 1800-1900'), 472

SABATIER, M. Paul, *À propos de la Séparation des Églises et de l'État*, 201

Schiaparelli, Signor G., *Astronomy in the Old Testament*, 431

Scholes, Dr. T. E. S., *Glimpses of the Ages*, 203

Scott Holland, Rev. Canon, *Personal Studies*, 468

Schultz, Dr., *Outlines of Christian Apologetics* (trs. A. B. Nichols), 218

Scott, Rev. C. Anderson, *The Book of the Revelation*, 446

Short Notices, 166, 430

Stapleton, Mrs. Bryan, *A History of the Post-Reformation Catholic Missions in Oxfordshire*, 227

TAYLOR, Archdeacon, *Ministers of the Word and Sacraments*, 209

Temple, Archbishop, Memoirs of (ed. Archdeacon Sandford), 270 *sqq.*: an unsatisfactory work, 271; Temple's debt to his mother's teaching, 272; at Blundell's (Tiverton): his love for 'the old Grammar School system,' 273; he wins the Balliol scholarship: anticipations for his future, *ib.*; at the university: a protracted struggle, *ib.*; unreserved correspondence with his mother, 274; contact

THO

with leaders of the Oxford Movement: his declaration of his theological position, 274 *sq.*; attraction to Romanism dispelled, 275; practical and intellectual pursuit of knowledge, 276; long service under the Committee of Council on Education, *ib.*; Temple head master of Rugby: his beneficent but unlimited despotism, 277; his immeasurable influence through the teachers whom he taught, 278; the secret of his influence, 278 *sq.*; the power of his preaching, 279; his connection with *Essays and Reviews*, 280; his opinion as to what blessings we may pray for, 281; Bishop of Exeter: how he overcame the difficulties of his position, 282; advice to his clergy: preaching: usefulness of expository sermons, 283; insistence on good reading in church, 284; brusqueness of manner in Temple, 285; his method of dealing with Ordinands, 285 *sq.*; his work for the establishment of the diocese of Truro, 287; friendship with Bishop (later Archbishop) Benson, *ib.*: Temple as Bishop of London: treatment of disputed matters of ritual, 288; his own theological position, 289; persistent advocacy of temperance, 290; Archbishop of Canterbury: the fourth Lambeth Conference, 291; his death: estimate of his character, 292

Thompson, Rev. W. H., *Professor Huxley and Religion* (Gresham Lectures), 224

Todd, Rev. J. C., *Politics and Religion in Ancient Israel*, 167

WALL, Mr. J. Charles, *Devils*, 208

Welsh Church, The, during the seventeenth century, 74 *sqq.*:

WOR

history of the beginnings of Welsh Dissent: William Wroth and 'the Saints,' 75; life and labours of Rhys Prichard, 76; a Puritan, patronized by Laud, 77; new methods introduced by Prichard into the office of preaching, 78; a Puritan failing in his character, 79; a collection of his rhyming sermons, 80; specimens of them, 81; large number of Welsh graduates of Jesus College, Oxford, 82; distinguished Welsh divines and Churchmen of the Caroline age, 82 *sq.*; the Principality was notoriously Royalist, 84; its punishment: appointment of 'the Commissioners of Wales (1650), 85; character of Vavasor Powell (one of the 'Approvers'), 86; the work and emoluments of the Commissioners and Approvers, 87; the ecclesiastical condition of Wales under their drastic rule, 88; John Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy*, 89; the numbers of ejected ministers, and the charges brought against them, 90; the utter confusion resulting, 91; a strong movement to obtain redress, 92; new Commissioners appointed, 93; beneficial effect of the Restoration and the Act of Uniformity (1662), 94; but Nonconformity had been spreading, 95; apathy and corruption in reign of William III., *ib.*; shining examples of Welsh Churchmen: Bishop William Lloyd, 96; appointment of English bishops to Welsh sees, 97

Westcott, Bishop, *History of the English Bible* (3rd ed.), 431

Wilberforce, Mr. R. G., *Bishop Wilberforce* ('Leaders of the Church 1800-1900'), 471

Workman, H. B., and Pope, R. M., *The Letters of John Hus*, 189

or
roth
and
76;
by
tro-
fice
tan
; a
ser-
em,
elsh
ege,
elsh
the
nci-
list,
int-
s of
r of
the
and
ion-
the
ales
88;
the
of
ges
the
; a
re-
ners
fect
Act
but
ead-
tion
ib.;
elsh
iam
ng-
7
the
chop
the
M.,
9